This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

1837
ARTES
SCIENTIA
VERITAS
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
TUEBOR
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

BR
1
.C5

THE

71962

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

VOL. X.

NEW SERIES, VOL. V.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY GRAY & BOWEN.

LONDON:
ROWLAND HUNTER, AND O. RICH, RED LION SQUARE.

1831.

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED BY E. W. METCALF AND CO.

CONTENTS

OF

VOL. X. — NEW SERIES, VOL. V.

No. I.

ART. I. — 1. The Library of Education. Edited by WILLIAM RUSSELL. Vol. I. Containing Some Thoughts concerning Education, by JOHN LOCKE, and a Treatise on Education, by JOHN MILTON.

2. Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School, and the other Parochial Institutions for Education, established in that City in the Year 1812; with Strictures on Education in general. By JOHN WOOD, Esq. - - - - - - 1

ART. II. — 1. Reports of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society.

2. Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society. - - - - - - - - - 15

ART. III. — A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for Christian Worship. - - - - - - - - - - - 30

ART. IV. — Professor STUART'S Appendix to his Exegetical Essays on several Words relating to Future Punishment. — A Letter. 34

ART. V. — The Works of the Rev. ROBERT HALL, A. M.. Minister of Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, England. First complete Edition; with a Brief Memoir of the Author. - 64

ART. VI. — 1. A Letter to William E. Channing, D. D. on the Subject of Religious Liberty. By MOSES STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover.

2. Two Letters to the Rev. Moses Stuart, on the subject of Religious Liberty. By BERNARD WHITMAN. - - - - 87

ART. VII. Dr. CODMAN's Speech in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, February 3, 1831. - - - - - 129

No. II.

ART. I. — Dr. CODMAN's Speech in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, February 3, 1831. - - - - - 137

ART. II. — The certain Triumph of the Redeemer. A Discourse, delivered in Murray Street Church, New York. By FRANCIS WAYLAND, D. D., President of Brown University. 161

ART. III. — Professor STUART's Appendix to his Exegetical Essays on several Words relating to Future Punishment. — A Letter. - - - - - - - - - - - - - 166

ART. IV. — 1. An Address on the Expediency and Duty of adopting the Bible as a Class-Book, in every Scheme of Education, from the Primary School to the University. Delivered at Columbia, South Carolina, December 4, 1829, before the Richland School. By THOMAS S. GRIMKÉ.

2. An Oration on the Advantages to be derived from the Introduction of the Bible and of Sacred Literature, as Essential Parts of all Education, in a Literary Point of View merely, from the Primary School to the University. Delivered before the Connecticut Alpha of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, September 7, 1830. By THOMAS S. GRIMKÉ, of Charleston, S. C. - - - - - - - - - 192

ART. V. — 1. The Young Reader; to go with the Spelling Book. By JOHN PIERPONT.

2. Peter Parley's Tales about the Sun, Moon, and Stars. With numerous Engravings.

3. Tales of Travels, West of the Mississippi. By SOLOMAN BELL, Late Keeper of the Traveller's Library, Province-House Court, Boston. With a Map, and numerous Engravings.

4. Cousin Elizabeth. By the Author of 'A Visit to the Sea-side.'
5. The Children's Robinson Crusoe; or the Remarkable Adventures of an Englishman, who lived Five Years on an unknown and uninhabited Island of the Pacific Ocean. By A LADY.
6. The Little Girl's Own Book. By Mrs. CHILD. - - 212

ART. VI. — 1. Sermons on Various Important Public Occasions. By ROBERT HALL, A. M., Leicester.
2. The Works of the Rev. ROBERT HALL., A. M., Minister of Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, England. First complete Edition, with a Brief Memoir of the Author.
3. Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Andrew Fuller, Late Pastor of the Baptist Church at Kettering, and First Secretary to the Baptist Missionary Society. By J. W. MORRIS. First American, from the last London Edition. Edited by RUFUS BABCOCK, Jun.
4. Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British India and its Dependencies. Vol. XXVIII. - - - - - - 220

ART. VII. — The Political Class Book; intended to instruct the Higher Classes in Schools in the Origin, Nature, and Use of Political Power. By WILLIAM SULLIVAN, Counsellor at Law. With an Appendix upon Studies for Practical Men; with Notices of Books suited to their Use; by GEORGE B. EMERSON. New Edition, with Amendments and Additions. 238

ART. VIII. — An Essay on Junius and his Letters; embracing a Sketch of the Life and Character of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, and Memoirs of certain other Distinguished Individuals; with Reflections Historical, Personal, and Political, relating to the Affairs of Great Britain and America, from 1763 to 1785. By BENJAMIN WATERHOUSE, M. D., Member of several Medical, Philosophical, and Literary Societies in Europe and America. - - - - - - 256

ART. IX. — The Way of Truth and Union. — For the Christian Examiner. - - - - - - - - - - 262

No. III.

ART. I. — Vues sur le Protestantisme en France. Par J. L. S. VINCENT, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Réformée de Nismes. 273

ART. II. — Letters to the Rev. Joel Hawes, D. D., in Review of his 'Tribute to the Memory of the Pilgrims.' By SAMUEL J. MAY, Pastor of the First Church in Brooklyn, Connecticut. - - - - - - - - - - - - 297

ART. III. — ORIGENIS Opera Omnia, quæ Græcè vel Latinè tantum extant, et ejus Nomine circumferuntur. Operâ et studio Caroli Delarue. - - - - - - - - - - 306

ART. IV. — On the Morality of our Political Situation. — For the Christian Examiner. - - - - - - - - - 327

ART. V. — The Biblical Repository. No. I. January, 1831. Conducted by EDWARD ROBINSON, Professor Extraordinary in the Theological Seminary at Andover. - - - - 346

ART. VI. — A Harmony of the Gospels, on the Plan proposed by LANT CARPENTER, LL. D. - - - - - - - - 358

ART. VII. — 1. Review of Mr. Whitman's Letters to Professor Stuart, on Religious Liberty. [From 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims.'] With an Appendix not before published.

2. A Reply to the Review of Whitman's Letters to Professor Stuart in 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims' for March, 1831. By BERNARD WHITMAN. - - - - - - - - 385

ART. VIII. — Translations of the Scriptures at Serampore. - 394

ART. IX. — On the Formation of the Christian Character. Addressed to those who are seeking to lead a Religious Life. By HENRY WARE, Jun., Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care in Harvard University. - - 400

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

No. XLIII.

NEW SERIES—No. XIII.

MARCH, 1831.

ART. I.—1. *The Library of Education.* Edited by WILLIAM RUSSELL. Vol. I. Containing *Some Thoughts concerning Education*, by JOHN LOCKE, and *A Treatise of Education*, by JOHN MILTON. Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1830. 12mo. pp. 317.

2. *Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School, and the other Parochial Institutions for Education, established in that City in the Year* 1812; *with Strictures on Education in general.* By JOHN WOOD, Esq. Printed at Edinburgh. Boston: Reprinted by Munroe & Francis. 1830. 12mo. pp. 204.

THE first of these volumes is a reprint of works which have been long known to scholars, but not, we presume, very generally read. Milton's Treatise, however, is so short, that, though it well deserves the space which it occupies in this publication, it cannot prove of much practical assistance to parents or teachers. The plan of Locke, in his 'Thoughts concerning Education,' embraced a greater variety of topics, and amplitude of discussion; and his work ought to be a manual with all who are interested in the important subject of which it treats. Its plain good sense, its lucid order, its excellent morality, make it one of the most valuable works which parent or teacher can read. We know not that we can praise it more highly than by saying, that it is just such a work as we should have expected from John Locke, the gentleman, philosopher, scholar, and Christian.

The 'Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School' deserves to become a standard on elementary instruction. It describes with minuteness of detail the results of actual experiment, and it is, which we certainly did not look for, not only a practical, but an entertaining book.

Encouraged by the appearance of these works, we venture to offer some remarks on the worn but not worn-out subject of moral education; for such works would hardly have been published here, if the interest of the community in the subject had ceased.

We have abundant reason for gratitude to Heaven, and to those instruments in the hands of Heaven, our worthy ancestors, for the numerous and excellent institutions of learning, and means of education which we in this country enjoy. For the most part, we evince our gratitude for them by the value which we set upon them; though we are not yet grateful enough, for we do not yet value them highly enough. We do not value them highly enough, because we do not correctly appreciate nor universally understand the great purpose and end of instruction. Many among us are not in the habit of regarding this purpose as a moral purpose, and this end as a moral end. We are afraid that, from the poorest to the richest of us, the mind is considered as the principal object of education, and the information of the mind as education's peculiar and ultimate design. Though there exists very remarkably in our country, or at least in this part of our country, a great desire in parents to secure an education to their children, and a general willingness to spend their money for this gift, yet we believe that it is common for the poor to bestow what means of education they can on their children, under the sole idea of preserving them from the disgrace and the inconvenience of ignorance, and for the rich to furnish their children with every accomplishment which wealth can command, with the predominant impression and hope that they are qualifying them to push their way in the world, and make a figure in the eyes of society. They do not seem to extend their views, or if at all, not with a due anxiety, to that far nobler and more important office of education, which is simply and beautifully described in the words of the prophet Ezekiel. They seem not to apprehend that it confers its best and most finished endowment on their offspring, only when it has taught them 'the difference between

the holy and profane, and caused them to discern between the unclean and the clean.'

This is education's perfect work. When it has done this, it has done every thing; and till it has done this, it has done nothing effectually. Who has a finished education, as far as any education may be called finished? Not he who is often complimented by the world on its possession. Not he who has been through all the most expensive schools, and yet without learning his duty to God and his neighbour. No; if he is master of all accomplishments; if his brain is filled to its remotest cell with all manner of knowledge, and still he does not discern, or does not act as if he discerned, between the unclean and the clean, his education is not finished in the most important respect; it is imperfect; it has stopped short of its destination, for it has stopped short of true wisdom, and the pupil is as yet immature, superficial, unfurnished. Who has a finished education? He has it, who, though he may have only learned to read and write, has learned, beside, the difference, the immense difference, between the holy and profane; has cultivated his moral capacities; has acquired sound opinions, and firm principles, and good habits; has preferred and chosen the paths and the rewards of virtue. His education is really finished, for its true end is attained; it has given him the wisdom to perceive, the ability to discharge, his personal, his social, his religious obligations; it has placed him as a column in the great fabric of human relations; and though he may not adorn that fabric, to the eye, as much as some other columns which art has more carefully enriched, he supports it quite as well in the simple beauty of strength and durability.

We mean not to say, that every thing which informs and enlarges and embellishes the mind, has not a natural tendency to educate the heart, and establish the character on enduring foundations. We cannot be such recreants to the noble cause and holy faith of letters. We believe that education, in all its fulness, and all its variety, has a powerful and beneficial influence on morals. It is precisely because we believe this, that we say it is never finished till it has exerted that influence; morals being its end. Mind is its first object, but it is not its only, nor its final object. Through the mind it must reach the moral sentiments and convictions, or it reaches not its mark. That is but a partial education,

which does not lead its pupil to the knowledge and the practice of duty. That is a complete education, the education of a man, which makes a man feel himself one; an accountable creature of God; a free and a noble spirit, discerning the difference between the holy and profane, the unclean and the clean, and renouncing the evil and embracing the good, for his own sake, for society's sake, and for God's sake.

That by such an education, and in no other way, or in no other way so well, some of the greatest blessings of life are to be widely and permanently secured, we have no doubt. If such an education is impracticable to any greater extent and degree than has already been attained, then, with all our faith in human improvement, we should be obliged to acknowledge that no further improvement was to be hoped for, in this world. A few remarks on some of the advantages which can only result from a general and thorough system of moral education, will best explain our reasons for attributing to it so great an importance.

We must be permitted to say, then, that we know not in what other way the best political blessings are to be secured to our country. We are as prosperous, as powerful, and as free as we are, chiefly because we have been thus far, and comparatively speaking, an intelligent and a moral people; because knowledge has been remarkably diffused among us, and our habits have been simple, and for the most part virtuous and religious. But luxury has increased with our wealth, corruption with our numbers, and ambition with our strength. The virtue which carried us through the time of our tribulation, may relax and be dissolved in the time of our prosperity. Those principles of honesty and justice and freedom which we only wrapped the more closely about us while the storms of persecution and poverty were blowing, may be loosened and perhaps thrown off under the warm suns of plenty and ease. It was a day of peril and of trial, when, to guard their rights and liberties against an arrogant and superior force, our fathers stood on the brink 'few and faint, yet fearless still,' and dared and suffered the worst; but, if we are not greatly mistaken, our country may see a day more perilous and trying than that; the day when it will have to contend with the passion and the pride and the lust of its own children. If it escapes from such a trial safely and with honor, it will be only owing to the prevailing

moral sentiment of the people, diffused through their mass by all the efforts and means of a moral education.

We form a republic. We are all politically equal. The right of government is shared by every individual in the nation; and Heaven forbid that it should be otherwise. But this right of government must be delegated somewhere. We must have rulers like other nations. We appoint these rulers ourselves, and in their hands we place in trust much of our happiness. What is to secure to us good rulers, rulers who will respect and watch that sacred deposit, but the widest diffusion of correct opinions and feelings through the influences of a moral education? What is to secure us against unprincipled rulers, but a deep respect for principle, and a stern, uncompromising demand for men of principle, and a universal determination to bestow no confidence on talent alone without principle? What is to secure us against the winding, specious, flattering arts of political quacks and demagogues, but an understanding sufficiently informed to detect those arts, and a virtue sufficiently elevated to despise them? What, in fine, is to carry the best men to the highest and most responsible places, but the existence and the predominance in the community of worth, of moral worth, which will appreciate and sympathize with, and seek out worth like its own, for honor, office, and trust? And how shall we secure this moral worth in the community, unless it is instilled, guarded, and confirmed by all the influences and appliances of a moral education universally diffused?

And what, again we ask, is to preserve us from a national passion for war and the deeds of war, an admiration of military fame, a love of dominion, a thirst for conquest? What is to preserve us from these things, which have been among the deepest stains and curses of the world from the world's childhood, but a general sentiment, which, with purged and undazzled eyes, shall view war rather as a scourge, a judgment, than as a theatre of glory? Why should we not go on, as other nations have gone on, extending our possessions by the sword, and losing them by the sword, attacking and attacked, spoiling and spoiled, and devoting treasure, talent, and life, to the insane purpose of fighting with the rest of the world, and entailing on ourselves that misery, be it splendid or otherwise, which is always entailed by ambitious war, unless we are taught by experience and religion to regard war

as that last, terrible resort, which good men in all ages, though not, alas! the multitude, have considered it to be? If we feel and think on this and kindred subjects as other nations have thought and felt, why should we not take the path of other nations, and stride on through luxury, and what is called glory, to ruin and oblivion?

Every thing depends, under Providence, on the education and intellectual and moral habits of our people. Where each man has, as here, a voice and a vote, the fate of the whole hangs on the disposition and character of the majority. If the majority, the great mass of the nation, are brought up to entertain sober views, to regard consequences, to suspect their passions and respect their reason, to divest themselves of sectional prejudices, to study the things that make for peace, to know and to feel the difference between the holy and profane, and to value virtue more than fame or eloquence or any thing else that can be named, then there can be no fear for our liberty, our prosperity, our union, or stability; no fear of enemies without or factions within, no fear of bad rulers, or misguided mobs, or any permanently evil influence, for power will be righteous, and righteousness will be all powerful; there will be a natural junction of right and might which nothing human can overcome and disturb. But if the majority are to grow up uninformed, undisciplined, discerning nothing but the present, and that but partially and passionately, overflowing with local and petty antipathies, south against north, and east against west, easily inflamed, easily led, and always most easily by the most interested guides, then fear may augur the worst.

These remarks are made without any reference to the present promises or prospects of the country, which we are willing to believe are of a favorable description. We have merely been drawing inferences from the nature of our government. We, the people, govern ourselves. The main object of our solicitude, therefore, an object of far more importance than any temporary question of party politics, should be, to know *how* to govern ourselves, or, which with us amounts to the same thing, how we ought to be governed. In other words, our first political duty is a moral self-education, as thorough as possible, and as widely diffused. If we faithfully attend to this duty, it requires little sagacity to predict that our destiny is a truly glorious one, the most glorious

that has yet been achieved on earth. If we neglect it, it requires as little to foresee, that if our fortune is not to be more melancholy than that of other nations has been, it will differ but little from the common course; we shall follow in the beaten track, and pursue the accustomed trade,

> 'A wild and dreamlike trade of blood and guile,
> Too foolish for a tear, too wicked for a smile!'

But we will pass from this topic, which may be thought to be of too general a nature, and touch upon one or two others which are more special and definite.

Let us speak of the influence of a moral education in suppressing or checking a vice which has been said, but we hope not truly, to be more common in this country than in any other. Whether more common or not, it is fearfully prevalent, and comparison is altogether unnecessary to impress us with a vivid sense of its magnitude. We mean the vice of intemperance. We need not describe it, its nature, character, or consequences. We need not tell how odious and degrading it is in itself, and how often it becomes the parent of other vices, as bad, or worse. Its ravages have been so extensive and terrible, that within a few years the public attention has been most seriously directed to it, and various measures have been proposed and tried with the design of arresting its progress. For this purpose, societies have been formed, sermons have been preached, tracts have been distributed, newspapers have been established. These means have in some degree, perhaps we should say, in a great degree, effected their end. Let them not be sneered at because they have not effected every thing. There was never a society formed yet, by sensible men, with a moral object in view, which did not accomplish something toward that object. United thoughts suggest expedients, and united efforts arrest public attention. Thus much has been done, if no more, by the societies which have been formed for the suppression of intemperance. From the nature of the case, this is about all which they can do, or ought to be expected to do. Much remains to be done by education, by moral education, which nothing but a moral education can do. The lessons of moderation must be particularly enforced on the young. They must be made to see the sure connexion between intemperance and shame and misery. They must be made to con-

sider a spectacle of intoxication in the street, as a subject, not of mirth, but of pity and dread. They must be taught that there are other and better social pleasures than that of drinking; that there are other and more effectual consolations in sorrow than that of drinking; and those pleasures and those consolations must be placed before them, and within their reach. They must be taught to feel that they have a nature too high and heavenly in its origin and capacities, to be enslaved to an indulgence lower than brutal. They must respect it, and fear to wrong and insult and debase it. They must be led to exercise self-government; to know their own strength, and to rejoice in it; to feel themselves superior to a poor temptation of appetite; to feel it to be impossible that they could ever sacrifice their respectability, their substance, their health, their talents, the feelings of their friends, and the favor of their God, to the vile solicitations of intemperance.

These are lessons which can and must be taught, more assiduously than they ever yet have been. These lessons of wisdom, prudence, and duty, begin at the beginning, and by preventing the vice, do better than cure it. They may be inculcated by various instructers, and in ten thousand different ways. They may be taught to the poor, as well as to the rich. There is nothing chimerical in the idea of such instruction. If there is, the idea of any improvement in this respect is chimerical. One thing appears to us very evident, which is, that nothing but lessons of morality and soberness, well taught and well learned, will make us a sober people; for nothing but a moral elevation will raise us above a moral reproach; and those who are low in their thoughts, sentiments, and principles, will be also low, and you cannot help it, in their pleasures and tastes.

There is another subject on which we would say a few words in this connexion, because it is also one which has occupied considerable attention in this portion of the country. We refer to the observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest. The reason for the attention which has been lately paid to this subject, is not that the Lord's Day has not been observed here, but that it has hitherto been observed with such extreme strictness, that any deviations from the former course have been regarded by many as alarming proofs of degeneracy. The truth is, that the Christian Sabbath is remarkably well kept in this section of the country; but as

population increases, variety of pursuits will keep pace with it, some of which will be incompatible with the strict observance of the day of rest. Travelling, for instance, of all kinds, will increase, and of course necessary travelling, and all the means, facilities, and appendages of travelling. To make a law which should distinguish between necessary and unnecessary travelling and their accompaniments, would be impossible. Nor would the people long submit to any law on the subject; nor ought they; it would be reversed, or it would fall into disuse. The only provisions which can be made with regard to it, are the provisions of moral education. We have begun well. We are in a good path. We have inherited from our forefathers a respect for the Lord's Day, its duties and its rest. We devoutly hope that the inheritance may never be undervalued or dissipated; that the feeling may never be diminished. But we are sincerely of opinion, that the only method of insuring so desirable an object, is to keep up, and indeed greatly to confirm and spread abroad the moral habits of the people, by making a moral education our chief concern. If we cherish among us a regard for religious privileges, for order, for peacefulness, for duty, we need not tremble for the Christian Sabbath. A day, which in its quiet observance harmonizes so beautifully with these blessings, and contributes so much to their security, will always be well observed. Man will see that it is made for him, for his use and for his good, and he will keep it holy. But if the public moral sentiment, and perception of obligation, and love of quiet happiness and intellectual occupation, are not fostered; if boisterous pleasures come to be preferred to peaceful ones, and dissipation to improvement, the Lord's Day, so long hallowed by us, and endeared to us, will be desecrated, as a matter of course, and a volume of laws could not prevent the desecration. We do not permit ourselves to harbour the fear that such an event will take place; but if it should, our Sabbath bells, which have heretofore rung out, on every first day of the week, their cheerful call to rest and praise and prayer, might well be taught to toll a knell throughout the land for the death of ancient virtue.

Why should we say more? The simple fact that the course and the fate of this country depend, under Providence, on the character of the mass of its inhabitants, is proof sufficient to my mind, that the moral education of all classes, and

all ages, but more particularly of the poor and the young, is the one thing needful. If the people are lifted up into knowledge, virtue, and respectability, their course will be an elevated one; if not, it will be a vulgar, and finally a miserable one; for they will take their own way.

If we are asked, what are the means of moral education, and how they are to be applied, and who shall apply them, we answer, the means are numberless, and they are to be applied in many various ways, and by many descriptions of persons, a few only of which we have time to specify.

Schools are to be supported with liberality, and multiplied to the extent of the demand. Too many children should not be crowded together in one school, nor more pupils be placed under one master than he can well attend to. Our good opinion of a town always rises, according to the number of schools which it contains in proportion to the number of its inhabitants.

The office of instructer of youth should always be regarded as an important and dignified office, and treated accordingly. Instructers of the best acquirements should always be sought for; and when found, should be honored and well supported. You certainly do not wish to look down on him as an inferior, who has the care of the minds of your children. But you cannot avoid doing so, unless his talents and attainments really entitle him to your respect; and you cannot think of obtaining one thus respectable, unless you afford to his labors that remuneration which they would secure in other professions. It is poor policy and poor economy, to look out for the cheapest schoolmaster who is to be had; for the cheapest is generally the dearest, because he is generally the least worth what is given for him. A good education, a really good education is the best legacy which you can leave to your children; and it becomes you to be sparing in any thing rather than in that. We do not mean that you should be extravagant, even in education; but, we adjure you, parents, by all that is worthy and respectable, by the honor and happiness of your children, and by your own hopes for them, do not consider education the least of necessaries, or the least of comforts; do not put it down among the lowest of your expenses; do not make it the last of your indulgences, but rather the first. It is, as we have said, the best legacy. It has no wings, like riches. It does not pass away with youth. It

cannot be alienated, and it only increases in value with years. Let the instructers of your children, therefore, be well qualified to instruct them. Above all, see that they are unimpeachable in their moral character; for no other qualification will supply the absence of this. The air of a school-room is tainted and poisoned by the presence of an immoral teacher; let not your children breathe it.

Books of instruction are to be carefully examined and selected, that they may always inculcate the soundest and purest views of life, conduct, and happiness, and inculcate them in the most engaging and convincing manner. Children receive many of their first and deepest impressions from school-books. It is highly important that these impressions should be of a virtuous stamp, and that they should also be associations of pleasantness.

No change in the modes of education, which promises to be a real improvement, should be slighted. We must not permit our attachment to old methods to prevent our adopting new ones which are better. Experiment is the natural pioneer of improvement, and should not be discouraged in its vocation and duty. Education has already been made to bear closely and powerfully on the mass. We should leave no means untried to make it bear still more closely and powerfully. Lyceums have done and are doing much in our villages. Public lectures have done and are doing much in our cities and towns. We have it from unquestionable authority, that crowds of young men attend constantly and with interest on these means of information, who, a little while ago, spent their evenings at places of resort, which are always very questionable, often fatal. This change cannot operate otherwise than to produce great and general benefit.

Parents—what a weight of responsibility there is upon them! How much the moral education of their children depends on their efforts, advice, and example! What a power they have over the character of the coming generation! How deeply does it concern them to inculcate on those entrusted to their care, the necessity of virtue and religion, and to show forth their beauty and glory by the whole course of their example! Vain will be the teachings of schools, if they are not confirmed at home. Vain will be the lessons of the tutor, if they are not seconded by the precepts and conduct of the father and the mother. The child must not only read of goodness

and purity in the books which are placed before him; he must read of them in the looks, the words, and the actions of those whom nature directs him to imitate, and habit brings him to resemble. There is hardly a sight so distressing, so alarming, to the real patriot and philanthropist, as the sight of parents, who, whatever they may teach with their lips, are teaching their children, day by day, in the constant tenor of their lives, to be selfish, to be frivolous, to be worldly, to be deceitful, to prefer earthly things to heavenly, to cherish the body and to forget the soul.

Parents and instructers should not only select good books for those who are committed to their oversight, but should qualify themselves for this and other kindred duties, by reading and digesting the best books on education, and thus instruct themselves. Much is doubtless to be left to the good sense and daily experience of those who have the guidance of the young; but we should be far from respecting the self-confidence of any one who should think himself above deriving assistance from such books as those the titles of which we have placed at the head of this article. He should have the care of no child of ours. And yet we should dislike a literal bigot to any particular system of education, as much as we dislike a bigot to a set of theological articles, or any system whatever.

As moral education is nearly connected with general education, the instruction which is given to all classes of society should be as generous and liberal, as various and elevated, as means and circumstances will allow. In a country like this, if you would have a moral people, you must have an educated people, a people who are taught something more than to read and write. Do not fear that education will make the poor vain and pedantic. Be assured that the more they know, the less vain they will be of their knowledge. And even if a variety of information, should have the effect upon them which is feared, it is far better that they should be vain and pedantic, than coarse, sensual, and criminal. There is no reason to apprehend that any considerable number of those who are to gain their living by their toil, will quit their tools and their shops, and turn knights-errant in a dim and visionary quest of literary adventure. A few individuals, peculiarly constituted, or peculiarly influenced, may do so; but common sense and necessity will keep all the rest to the work

or employment to which they are bred, and for which they are fitted, and in which, whatever it may be, every one may raise himself above want and above contempt. The great evil to be apprehended is a want rather than an excess of a disposition to mental exertion and improvement. For what are the principal causes of crime? They are inconsiderateness and idleness. They are the want of habits of reflection, and the want of innocent and interesting employment. Both of these wants are supplied by education. Teach people to reflect and give them the means of mental occupation, and in general they will avoid crime, because they will be aware of its miserable consequences, and will have something better to think of and to accomplish. Every exercise of the mind which causes it to know how to use itself, and every species of information which furnishes it with objects of employment, is a more powerful security against crime, than any physical durance which can be devised.

The last chapter of Wood's 'Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School' contains a lively and complete answer to those who are wont to lift up their voices in dismal prophecies of the fatal effects of instructing the poor beyond their alphabet. We wish we could make several extracts from this chapter, but we must content ourselves with one.

'And what is it after all, which is deemed so peculiarly objectionable in the education furnished by the Edinburgh Sessional School? Is it that the poor are there taught to *read?* No! our objectors now tell us, "Give them by all means as much reading, writing, and arithmetic, as you please." What then? Can it be right to teach them to read, but wrong to make them *understand* what they read? It would be quite idle for us to pause to point out the absurdity of so futile an objection. But, if our readers have gone along with us in some of the preceding observations, they will be inclined to think the objection something worse than absurd. They will at once perceive, that if *reading* is to be put within the reach of the humbler classes, it is absolutely essential, not only in order to give them the full benefit of that reading, but as a preservative against the dangers to which they may be exposed from improper publications, that their minds should at the same time receive due cultivation, and be adequately fortified against the assaults of the unprincipled and designing. There are others who tell us, "We make no objection to your *explaining;* that is all quite right and necessary, but as for your *Geography,* — what have these poor creatures to do with geography?" In

other words, "Explain to them every thing else but places; tell them what you please about animals, and plants, and stones; but, as you prize their happiness, or the good of mankind for any sake, tell them nothing about countries, or cities, or rivers, their situation, or the circumstances for which they are remarkable." This is a distinction which we own we are quite unable to understand. There appears to us in truth to be no study more innocent than geography, and few more useful or better adapted to all classes of society. What possible injury can accrue to a child from knowing where Glasgow or London is, or even Paris or Petersburg, or any of those places where his friends happen to be, or of which he has occasion to read or to hear? When in reading about St. Paul's travels, for example, the child comes to the word "Cyprus," and asks what Cyprus is, may we tell him that it is a word of six letters and two syllables, with the accent on the former syllable,—point out to him its orthography, anxiously warning him against substituting an *i* for a *y*,—and perhaps moreover inform him, that it is a noun of the neuter gender, singular number, and objective case; but when the child still presses us to tell him what the word means, must we say to him, "My dear boy, we may teach you the proper sound, spelling, and grammar of this word, but with this you must be content; ask no more, for this is one of those things which it is deemed dangerous, and we are therefore not permitted, to explain to you." Some one perhaps will retort, that "he has no dislike to a child being told incidentally where a place is, that his objection only extends to every thing like regular teaching by a *map*, and that in the present instance he thinks it would be quite wrong not to tell the child that Cyprus is an island in the Mediterranean Sea." But what danger lurks behind a map? And is it not quite obvious that to a pupil placed in such circumstances as our objector would have him, the Mediterranean sea must be just as unintelligible as Cyprus previously was and still is?'—pp. 202, 203.

Let every thing be taught, then, for which there is time and opportunity. Away with that libel and insult on the mind of man, that it was not formed for improvement, and that knowledge is not good for it. Pour down instruction on the land, even on our land, like rain, for even yet it is dry and athirst. 'Let the ridges thereof be watered abundantly. Let the showers drop upon the pastures and the wilderness, till they rejoice on every side, and shout and sing!'

ART. II. — 1. *Reports of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society.* Boston. 1830. pp. 330.

2. *Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society.* Boston. 1830. pp. 96.

WE regret that we have not sooner called the attention of our readers to the subject of prison discipline, and to the Reports we have named above. It is a subject, the importance of which, in the present state of our community, can hardly be exceeded or exaggerated; and it is treated, in the Reports of the managers of the Boston society, in so thorough and able a manner, as to leave little to be desired or added. In our notice of them we propose merely to invite attention to the subject; or rather, we wish to urge the propriety of devoting some portion of our time or substance to this interesting and important mode of exercising Christian charity. If it be true of any form of mercy, that 'it blesseth him that gives, and him that takes,' it is doubly so of this, which seeks to devise the best means of saving society from crime, and reclaiming the guilty violaters of its laws; of restoring those, who, either through a long course of vice, or a single false step, have forfeited their station in society; of awakening the better principles which slumber within them, and thus imitating and coöperating with the providence of God; of promoting at once the good of those within and those without the walls of the prison, and producing effects, the advantage of which may be felt by others and by ourselves, through the whole course of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.

It is quite enough for our purpose, however, to point out the direct, immediate, temporal advantages which may ensue from a judicious reform in the discipline of our prisons. The facts stated in these Reports afford abundant means of doing this, and, at the same time, hold out the most encouraging prospect of success as the reward of exertion. When the reform of the criminal code was adopted, which substituted imprisonment as the punishment for various crimes, instead of death, the pillory, or the scourge, arrangements were made, which, from want of sufficient attention to the great difficulties of the subject, or of that knowledge which perhaps experience alone could supply, were entirely inadequate to the end proposed; and instead of converting our jails into peniten-

tiaries, rendered them schools in which vice was taught with great ability and success. The unrestrained intercourse of the prisoners with each other, the want of classification, and the improper regulation of the intercourse of the officers with the prisoners, afforded facilities of corruption which were eagerly used by the abandoned inmates of those receptacles of crime; and every year great numbers were discharged from them, either by the expiration of the time for which they were sentenced, or by the frequently abused power of pardon, whose residence there had served no other purpose than to qualify and perhaps induce them to venture upon crimes which they had, previously, little inclination and little ability to commit. It was thought enough if these prisons could be made profitable in a pecuniary way to the Commonwealth; this, indeed, was regarded as the great test and criterion of the usefulness of the institution, — as if the crimes conceived, planned, and matured in those abodes of profligacy, would not levy a heavier tax on the community, than if their inmates had all been supported, in luxury, during their lives, by the treasure of the state.

As the saving of life, without increasing the burdens of society, was generally regarded as the great benefit to be derived from penitentiaries, productive labor naturally became the principal object of attention to the directors and officers of these institutions. Nothing or little else was thought of, than to make the labor of the convicts profitable; and if, by any extraordinary stimulus, more than was estimated as a fair day's-work could be obtained from them, the profits were reserved for themselves, or shared with their immediate supervisors. Thus, an intelligent, active young man might be thoroughly initiated into the arts and mysteries of iniquity by a few months' residence in the state prison, and be discharged with his education finished, his apprenticeship served, and a fund in his pocket against future accidents, or to be used as a means of procuring assistance or protection in his too probable course of crime. This need not be stated hypothetically. It is matter of history. It was well known to be so; and great was the fear and the sorrow felt by the philanthropic, lest it should eventually be necessary to give up the hope of any reform, and resort to the previous system of punishment, barbarous as it was, in preference to establishing, by public authority, schools of mutual corruption. The evils

of the penitentiary system, as it was called, were universally perceived to be enormous; they became too crying to be longer neglected; and wise and prudent men, in different parts of the country, began to turn their attention to the subject, and devise means of amending the whole system. The formation of the Prison Discipline Society has contributed in no small degree to this object. By its labors, or rather by those of its Secretary, who is its principal agent, by his personal investigations and unremitted industry, the secret mischiefs of the prison-house have been developed, whatever good has been effected has been made known, and many most valuable improvements have been introduced. Above all, the attention of the public, and especially of those who are in places of power, and therefore of responsibility, has been in some degree roused; the necessity of legislative interference and executive watchfulness has been demonstrated; and there is now reason to hope, that a fair trial of a truly penitentiary system may be made in many, if not all parts of our country. The intercourse between the prisoners will be restrained, and that between the officers and the convicts will be differently regulated. Silent solitude at night, silent labor by day, religious services daily and weekly, and elementary instruction to the ignorant, must produce a very different state of things in our prisons from what existed when instruction was neglected, silence was not enforced, and the daily and nightly communications of convicts were adapted to bring them all to one level of gross and shocking depravity.

To exhibit the progress which has been made in the improvement of state prisons, and the agency of this Society in introducing it, we propose to give a very brief table of the contents of the Reports which have been annually made by its Secretary. In the first, the best principles of the construction of prisons were pointed out, in relation to security, inspection, light, ventilation, cleanliness, and health. The proper regulations with regard to neatness, classification, diet, employment, and punishment were given; the comparative increase of the population of the country, and of crime, was stated, with the causes and remedies of many existing evils; and on all these subjects an already intimate acquaintance with them, and a clear perception of the proper course to be pursued, were manifested.

In the Second Report, the principal evils existing in the different penitentiaries were stated more in detail, and the necessary remedies were also dwelt upon. Very interesting accounts were given of the crimes which brought convicts to these places of punishment, and of those the taste for which they were likely to acquire there; of the system of mutual instruction in vice and roguery; of the mischief of confining together the old and the young, the lunatic and the sane; and of the great expense and the great mortality of some of the prisons. The necessity was shown of attention to the causes of crime, and the means of its increase; and the best methods of checking its growth within the prison walls were insisted on; such as, the selection of proper officers, constant employment by day and solitary confinement by night, silence at all times, and the opportunity for intellectual and religious instruction. A view of the condition of many of the prisons in the country was then given, most of which had been the subject of the personal inspection of the writer; and the list of them will show a diligence and perseverance worthy of all commendation. It comprises an account of the state prisons of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York City, Sing Sing, Auburn, New Jersey, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, Baltimore, Washington, Virginia, and a brief notice of those of Georgia, Kentucky, and Ohio.

In the Third Report, a statement was made, showing what had been done towards effecting a reform in many of the prisons before mentioned, providing instruction, and diminishing expenses; what prisons yet required improvement; and generally what had been accomplished, and what yet remained to be done in this great and good work. One very interesting table is given in this Report, of a considerable number of convicts, respecting whom inquiries were made after their discharge from the Auburn prison, where they had been subjected to the best existing system of discipline; and there is great reason to rejoice in the probability it shows, that the effect of that discipline was not lost, but in many instances exhibited itself in a permanent influence on their characters. But we intend to recur to this subject again.

In the Fourth Report, additional information was given with respect to what had been done in relation to the discipline of prisons; an abstract of the criminal law was added of the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachu-

setts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and of the provisions of Mr. Livingston's code for Louisiana. The inequality of the laws, in these states, was pointed out, and the disproportion, in some of them, between the punishments for crimes of different degrees of atrocity. The importance of having the laws known and intelligible was also insisted on. Statements were then made, showing the direct and indirect effects of the labors of this Society.

In the Fifth and last Report, the history of reform in prisons was continued; and that we may give to our readers, if there are any of them who have not perused these Reports, an idea of the nature of the reform desired and pursued, and of the business-like yet interesting manner in which all these papers are written, we shall extract that part of it which relates to the prison in Charlestown.

'In Massachusetts, the New Prison was finished and occupied during the last year. A competent witness, on the spot, says, a greater change was produced in the behaviour of the convicts, in a few weeks after they entered the solitude of the New Prison, than had been produced by the combined influence of all the causes which had been brought to bear upon it during the preceding year and a half.

'Soon after the new building containing the dormitories was completed, a small building, containing an apartment for the accommodation of a Sabbath School, was erected, where about fifty convicts of the younger class are instructed, on the Sabbath, under the immediate superintendence of the Chaplain.

'The Legislature, at the last session, having witnessed the progressive improvement in this Institution, authorized the erection of a new chapel. This chapel was commenced in April, and finished and dedicated to the service of Almighty God, in May. It is a very convenient, economical, and pleasant place of worship.

'These improvements in the buildings at Charlestown are not more worthy of notice than the improvement in discipline. This will be apparent from a brief statement of facts concerning it, arranged according to the division of time. From the locking up at night till morning light, all the convicts, except an average of about five in the hospital, are in the new building, in separate cells, and in cells so arranged, that a sentinel, on duty, can preserve entire silence among three hundred. The space around the cells being open from the ground to the roof, in front of four stories of cells, in a building two hundred feet in length, furnishes a perfect sounding gallery, in which the sentinel is placed, who can

hear a whisper from the most distant cell. He can therefore keep silence from the time of locking up at night to the time of unlocking in the morning, which, at some seasons of the year, makes more than one half of all the time, which is thus secured from evil communication. From the time of unlocking in the morning, about twelve minutes are occupied in a military movement of the convicts, in companies of thirty-eight, with an officer to each company, in perfect silence, to their various places of labor. At the end of about twelve minutes, it is found, that there is a place for every man, and every man in his place. This is as true of the officers as of the convicts. If an officer has occasion to leave his place, the system requires that a substitute be called. If a convict has occasion to leave his place, there is a token provided for each shop, or for a given number of men, so that from this shop or number only one convict can leave his place at a time. The consequence is, that with the exception of those who have the tokens in their hands, any officer of the Institution may be certain of finding, during the hours of labor, a place for every man, and every man in his place. There is, however, a class of men, consisting of ten or twelve, called *runners* and *lumpers*, whose duty consists in moving about the yard. But even their movements are in silence and order. Consequently, during the hours of labor, the convicts are never seen moving about the yard promiscuously, or assembled in little groups, in some hiding-places of mischief, or even two and two in common conversation. All is order and silence, except the busy hum of industry, during the hours of labor.

'The hours of labor, in the morning, vary a little with the season of the year, but amount at this season to nearly two hours, from the time of unlocking in the morning till breakfast. When the hour for breakfast comes, almost in an instant, the convicts are all seen marching in solid and silent columns, with the lock step, under their respective officers, from the shops to the cells. On their way to the cells, they pass the cookery, where the food, having been made ready, is handed to them, as they pass along; and at the end of about twelve minutes from the time of ringing the bell for breakfast, all the convicts are in their cells, eating their breakfast, silently and alone. One officer only is left in charge, to preserve silence; and the others are as free from solicitude and care, till the hour of labor returns, as other citizens.

'When the time of labor again returns, which is at the end of about twenty-five minutes, almost in an instant, the whole body of convicts are again seen marching as before to their places of labor. On their way to the shops, they pass through the chapel, and attend prayers. The time from breakfast till dinner passes away like the time for labor before breakfast, all the convicts being

found in their places industriously employed, in silence. The time assigned for dinner is filled up in the same manner as the time assigned for breakfast; and the time for labor in the afternoon, in the same manner as the time for labor in the morning; and when the time for evening prayers has come, at the ringing of the bell, all the convicts, and all the officers not on duty elsewhere, are seen marching to the chapel, where the Chaplain closes the day with reading the Scriptures and prayer. After which the convicts march with perfect silence and order to their cells, taking their supper as they pass along. In about five and twenty minutes from the time of leaving their labor, the convicts have attended prayers in the chapel, taken their supper, marched to their cells with their supper in their hands, and are safely locked up for the night. This is the history of a day at Charlestown; and the history of a day is the history of a year, with the variations which are made, on the Sabbath, by dispensing with the hours of labor, and substituting the hours for instruction in the Sabbath School, and the hours for public worship.

'We offer a single remark in regard to this statement, concerning the discipline of the Prison at Charlestown. It is the Auburn system well introduced; and what has been done at Charlestown can be done elsewhere.

'If, now, the present Warden shall be as successful, in the management of the Institution, in securing favorable pecuniary results, as he has been in introducing the new discipline, he will show himself to be an invaluable public officer. He merits and receives great praise for what he has already done.'—pp. 336–338.

The greater part of the last Report is taken up with statements of facts and opinions on the subject of imprisonment for debt, and an abstract of the laws of several of the states on this subject. The Secretary has taken great pains to obtain a correct expression of public opinion on this topic, by addressing letters to many individuals in different parts of the country, some of whose names are among the most distinguished we have to boast, requesting their views in relation to it. The unanimity of their abhorrence of the present operation of the laws of debtor and creditor is not surprising, and we hope soon to see the effect of the expression of the opinions of such men in a thorough reform of our system. Ancient as is the custom of imprisoning for debt, and it is among the most so of all the punishments on record, there can be no doubt in the minds of those who will attend to the subject, or read this Report, that it is, at the present day, inadequate to the end proposed, morally injurious to both parties, and

every way injurious to the indebted, unequal in its operation upon different classes of debtors, dreadfully cruel to those who are dependent, perhaps for their daily bread, upon the daily labor of their imprisoned husband or father, unworthy of those whose boast it is that they would not barter their political, still less their personal freedom for gold, and in the highest degree unbecoming in those who pray for the forgiveness of their debts, as they forgive their debtors. What remedy is to be applied to the multiplied evils of the existing system, we cannot undertake to determine; but sure we are, that some change must be made in one which is at variance with the judgment and feelings of the better part of the community, and with the principles of the religion by which we profess to be guided. Public opinion is manifestly in favor of an alteration of the laws on the subject; and the sooner our legislatures adopt those measures which will satisfy that public opinion, the better will be the evidence of their justice, patriotism, and humanity. In the mean time the attention of the public, of those who in fact direct the measures which the government, in this country, necessarily follow, ought to be turned to the question; and we glad are that the Prison Discipline Society have done so much to this purpose. We trust that it will also use its efforts for the introduction of a system of discipline in our county jails, corresponding to that which is so valuable in the penitentiaries. The evils arising from the improper construction of the buildings, insufficient discipline, the want of religious instruction and moral influence, are scarcely less in these places than in the state prisons; and still greater numbers are exposed to the contamination of evil communications and idleness.* The same, or similar remedies are necessary; and we hope that the pursuit will never be given up, till every jail in the country shall exhibit the good effects of a wise benevolence, and become a place where the guilty may not merely be punished, but where their faults may be corrected and their lives amended.

But we sometimes hear it said, and by those whose opinions are entitled to respect, that all hope of reforming the

* The 'Letter' addressed, about a year ago, by the Rev. Dr. Tuckerman to the Mayor of Boston, respecting the House of Correction and the common jail of the city, proves the existence of the same evils there, which have been discovered in the penitentiaries.

hardened criminals of our prisons is entirely visionary, the mere enthusiasm of benevolent men. 'Do you expect,' say they, 'to abolish crime? Can you change the skin of the Æthiopian, or the spots of the leopard? The utmost that can be effected is to save society from crime, by confining the perpetrators of it; and if their labor can be made to support them, the public will realize the great advantage of safety from dangerous subjects without expense, and without wounding the feelings or conscience of those who object to capital punishments. As this is all that can be done, it would be better not to attempt any thing else.'

Is it so? Can even this be done without attempting something more? In order to effect it, every offender of whatever degree of criminality that deserves the punishment of imprisonment, must be confined for life, or society is not safe from his criminal propensities. And can this be done? Would this be justice? If not confined for life, the public must be, at some time or other, again exposed to his depredations, with an appetite sharpened by his compulsory abstinence, and stimulated by the desire of vengeance upon the authors of his suffering. He would, at the same time, be better qualified for his trade of villany, by the acquaintance he must have gained with the arts of his associates, unless his intercourse with them were restrained by something more than the necessity of performing a daily task. There is another error involved in the reasoning we have just stated. It rests on the supposition, that every individual sent to a prison as a criminal is a thorough-bred, hardened, unchangeable villain; than which few suppositions, as we are glad to believe, have less foundation in fact. Hundreds have been sent there at so early a period of their lives, that however shocking specimens they may have been of youthful depravity, it is hardly conceivable that their habits of iniquity could have become so fixed as to be incorrigible under a wholesome, judicious, and kind discipline. Thousands have been sent there, whose ignorance was so deplorable, as almost to equal that of the Ninevites of old; and if in such blackness of intellectual darkness they have lost the path of virtue, is it hopeless that they will regain it, when the dawning light of knowledge and religion shall arise to guide them? Others have been sent there, who have fallen into crime from perhaps a single, strong, unexpected temptation, which they were not prepared

to resist, but the consequences of which have already awakened penitential feelings within them, that require only opportunity for reflection and the aid of friendly counsel, warning and admonition, to ripen into the fruits of good living; but would soon be drowned and overwhelmed in the ridicule, and corrupting intercourse of more profligate companions.

The truth is, that the number is comparatively small of those, who by the abuse of opportunities, the advantages of circumstance or education, have hardened themselves into incorrigible and desperate offenders. And even of this small class, why should it be thought a thing incredible that God should raise the dead in trespasses and sins to a new and better life? What should prevent us from at least making the attempt? Is it too costly an undertaking? It costs nothing. The discipline, the moral influence which we desire to introduce, are the very best means of making the prison profitable. But supposing it were costly, will any man weigh the value of character against dollars and cents? The reformation of a single impenitent inhabitant of those gloomy walls were worth more than all the expense, the pains, the prayers, that have been, or will be bestowed upon them; and there should be, and there is, on earth, as well as in heaven, 'joy over one sinner that repenteth.' Is it an undertaking so utterly desperate and hopeless, that it is not worth while to labor for it? We think not. We have already pointed out some reasons for hoping that many might be reclaimed, or at least improved, by the use of suitable means; and we are happy to be able to show that those hopes are confirmed by experience. Such means have been used, and, by the blessing of God, they have not been without success. In the Third Report of the Prison Discipline Society there is a table (23d page of the 2d edition) containing the initials and general character of one hundred and sixty convicts, as they were known to be before their imprisonment, and as they were found after they had been discharged from the Auburn prison, 'by inquiries directed to post-masters, sheriffs, district attorneys, and other public officers.' Of that number, 'a hundred and twelve are described as decidedly steady and industrious, or very greatly improved; and twelve as somewhat reformed.' More than three quarters of those discharged, therefore, were better men and better members of society than when convicted.

We were much struck with the number of those mentioned in this table, as having partially or entirely corrected habits of intemperance; not merely because this propensity is one of the most difficult to reform, but because there is a direct connexion between intemperance and crime, which we think has not been so much attended to as it deserves to be. The natural effect of intemperance in producing poverty, and thus increasing the temptations to vice, has often been remarked and very forcibly shown. But we believe, that many a crime has been committed in a fit of intoxication, from which the unhappy perpetrator would have shrunk with horror in the sober possession of his faculties. The maxim of the law, that a state of drunkenness is no excuse for the offence, is doubtless a just and necessary one; but can we regard as equally guilty in a moral view, the cold-blooded, deliberate murderer, and him who, in a drunken brawl, strikes a blow, the force of which he is no longer in a condition to measure? Can we avoid some commiseration for the feelings of surprise, mortification, and horror of one who, perhaps not habitually vicious, first awakes to a sober consciousness of having exposed himself to ignominious, or capital punishment, in the confusion of an inebriated brain? We do not wish to excuse the guilt of the drunkard, nor to excite sympathy in his favor; but we desire to point to an argument, which we think might be used with more effect than it has been, to impress upon the inconsiderate the horrible dangers to which the loss of the controlling power of reason exposes them.

Another fact, shown by this table, appears to us important. It is the large proportion of those sentenced for passing or making counterfeit money. No less than thirty-four out of a hundred and sixty, or more than one fifth of the whole number of convicts, were imprisoned for this offence; and as this is one, the temptations to which are particularly increased by the institutions of our society, we are doubly bound to take heed not to place such stumbling-blocks unnecessarily in the way of the weak in virtuous principle. By a list of altered and counterfeit bank notes given in the Second Report (page 25), it is shown that the greater part of these notes are of small denominations, generally of less than five dollars, rarely exceeding that sum. The system on which banking operations have been carried on among us has multiplied prodigiously the number of notes of these small

amounts, and thus greatly increased the temptation and the facility of counterfeiting. This is far from being the only ill consequence of small bills. They have withdrawn a great amount of the precious metals from circulation; and therefore have a strong tendency to the injury of the poorer classes of the community, among whom their use is most common, and upon whom principally the loss must fall, in the case either of the bills being counterfeited, or the bank becoming insolvent. In the states of New York and Pennsylvania, the banks are now prohibited from circulating bills below the denomination of five dollars; and the effect of this regulation, as we are informed, is manifestly good. We hope, as the period for renewing bank charters in this Commonwealth is approaching, our legislature may be induced to follow the example which has been set by other states, and thus greatly promote the good of the community, at a very trifling sacrifice on the part of the banks. The profit derived from the circulation of small bills is an inconsiderable item in their accounts; it is a privilege for which they certainly would not pay any large sum; and it would not be the least benefit of adopting such a regulation, that the number of convicts in our prisons would in all probability be materially diminished.

In the Fourth Report (pages 23, 24, of the 2d edition) we have the following statement;

'Intelligence has been received, during the last year, in answer to letters addressed to post-masters and sheriffs, in all parts of the state of New York, concerning two hundred and six discharged convicts; of whom one hundred and forty-six are reformed. Concerning many of the hundred and forty-six here mentioned, information has been received three years in succession, giving them the same character; and some of them the character of decidedly pious men. Three years ago, this system of inquiry concerning discharged convicts was first instituted. The first year, it brought favorable returns concerning fifty-two; the second year, concerning one hundred and twelve; and the third year, as already stated, concerning one hundred and forty-six.

'There is another class of facts proving the same thing concerning the reformatory character of the prison at Auburn. The recommitments in 1827, out of four hundred and twenty-seven, were only nineteen. And in 1829, out of five hundred and seventy, only seventeen.'—pp. 257, 258.

Again we have evidence, and of course stronger evidence than before, as another year had passed, of the benefit actu-

ally conferred on the convict, and on society by the discipline of the prison. The proportion of those improved is as great as before. Nor do we perceive that this evidence is in any way impeachable. District attorneys and sheriffs do not usually belong to those classes of persons who might be suspected of any bias in favor of discharged convicts, nor are they commonly liable to any suspicion of a visionary or enthusiastic turn of mind. On the contrary, they are generally men who are not easily imposed upon by any of the tricks or deceptions of the worst portion of society, and who would be rather slow than otherwise to believe in the reformation of those whom they had known to be convicted of infamous crimes. Who shall say, after this, that the reformation of the criminals of our prisons is a hopeless attempt? If a twentieth part of the number reported as improved, in the short space of time since the introduction of the better system of discipline, had been so described by the persons to whom application was made, we should have taken encouragement as to the possibility of success upon a longer and fairer trial; but to have such a return within three years, affords not merely encouragement, but the certainty of so great a degree of success as renders it incumbent upon the public to provide, at once, the necessary means of producing such reforms. There is no excuse for delay. The experiment has been tried, and has resulted in the best good of society, and of those who are temporarily secluded from it.

But we may be met, perhaps, by an objection of an opposite kind. 'If the good to be obtained and the means of obtaining it are so clear and certain, why all this earnestness? Why call so strongly upon every one to do what is manifestly for his interest? State your case, and prove your facts, and it will be enough. All will then be as ready as you could wish, to adopt so desirable a system.' If this were always so, improvements would proceed with a much more rapid pace than we find they usually do. And perhaps it is not desirable that they should be so easily attained. Obstacles are not wanting to this, more than to other decided improvements which are from time to time suggested. In the first place, there is no small class of persons interested in perpetuating the old system of things; and from them opposition in every form is to be expected, and is found. Already has the indefatigable agent of this society encountered, in his attempts at

reform in three different states, opposition the most determined, misrepresentation, personal abuse, and slander; and some of the statements of facts in the last Annual Report have called forth similar obloquy from another quarter. Besides this, there is a *vis inertiæ* in the public mind, which it generally requires no small effort to overcome; and the subject of prison discipline forms no exception to this remark. Important as it is in all its bearings, public attention has been by no means adequately called to it as yet. Much remains to be done on this point; and it is not by one nor by a few insulated efforts, that this object can be attained. Dr. Tuckerman's Letter to the Mayor of Boston last year, to which we have referred, contained appalling statements with regard to the condition and discipline of those confined in the House of Correction and jail; yet the public was little excited by them, and the letter itself has not been extensively read. Almost every grand jury, also, whose duty it is to inspect the county jails, has become acquainted with facts which might have excited attention, had they been properly stated, and sufficiently repeated.*

---

* To show the imperious necessity of immediate and active attention to this subject of prison discipline, we add the following extract from a late New York paper, which confirms in the strongest manner some of the remarks we have made.

'*New York, Jan.* 8. — We have no institutions more flourishing than our prisons. It is but a few years since the State Prison at Auburn was erected, with five hundred cells, and it is now full to overflowing; the number of inmates being six hundred and sixteen. The number of prisoners at Sing Sing is eight hundred and six. Total 1422; showing an increase during the past year of one hundred ninety-four; and this, notwithstanding seventy-six have been pardoned by the Executive. Provision has been made for the erection of two hundred additional cells in the prison at Sing Sing, and even these, if we reason from the past, will scarcely suffice for another year. "It is evident," says Governor Throop in his late Message, "that our prisons must be enlarged without delay." Of the prisoners at Sing Sing who have "entered" during the past year, *one hundred and fourteen* are from the City of New York. And yet the number of villains among us is not perceptibly diminished!

'The fact is, that this city has become a sort of catch-all for rogues and vagabonds from every part of the country, and indeed from many foreign countries; and although our law-mills are kept constantly in operation, the consumption is not greater than the supply. Far be it from us to libel the general character of our population; which is probably not surpassed in moral excellence by any city of equal magnitude on the globe. But at the same time, the facts above stated are

There is a great work well begun. Enough has been accomplished to prove its practicability and value; but those who are engaged in it require all the encouragement and support which they can find in the favorable regard of the better part of the community. 'It is no trifling matter,' as has been in substance well observed in another place,—'it is no trifling matter to be exposed, as reformers often are, to the sneering charge of a visionary, enthusiastic character. Still less is it a trifle to be publicly misrepresented, injuriously accused, slandered, calumniated. No man can be envied for this, and more than this, to which the attempt at great improvements often exposes him; and when we see any one willing to step forward to sweep away old abuses, to encounter the storm of obloquy and persecution raised by those who are interested to perpetuate them, we cannot but say from our hearts, God speed him, and God bless him.' We trust that great success is to be the ultimate and not distant result of the labors of this Society, and its unwearied, judicious, devoted agent. When we look back upon what has been done in this immense field, by the wise and assiduous efforts of a single individual, in the course of a few years, we are greatly encouraged with regard to the future prospect, and we hope his hands and his heart will be strengthened in the great work he has undertaken. We shall not offer any counsel as to the best modes of correcting evils, or introducing improvements. Those who are engaged in the pursuit understand these things far better than we can pretend to do; but we will express our hope that they will be deterred by no difficulty, misrepre-

---

undeniable and appalling. They admonish us to make use of every possible means as well for the prevention as the punishment of crime. Much is to be expected from the influence of Sabbath Schools; which, though of comparatively modern date, have already done much to preserve the real population of the city in a healthy state. Scarcely an instance is on record, of an individual who has enjoyed the benefit of Sunday School instruction, being convicted of a heinous offence against the laws. The promotion of temperance, so far as it extends, is another important item in the means of preventing crime; since it is a truth, to which all our magistrates can bear witness, that much the greater part of the cases that come under their cognizance, are either directly or indirectly the consequence of intemperance. It is therefore the interest of our citizens, as they regard their own safety and that of their families and property, to encourage these laudable undertakings, and every other instrumentality which has for its object the promotion of good morals and the eradication of vicious propensities.'—*Journal of Commerce.*

sentation, or obloquy from continuing the course upon which they have entered. Let them pursue it, as they have begun, with an energy and perseverance worthy of the cause, till every prison shall be converted into a house of reform, and punishment shall be regarded more in relation to the security of society and its future effect upon the character, than to its bearing upon past delinquencies.

ART. III. — *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for Christian Worship.* Boston. Carter & Hendee. 1830. 18mo.

THE greatest perfection to which religious poetry has yet been carried is in the 'Psalms of David.' The history of David gives more than its usual truth to the maxim, that the first successful efforts in any kind of composition have commonly an absolute excellence, and all succeeding works have an inferior comparative merit. The Bible was translated into English at a time, however unfavorable for the pure transmission of its doctrine, the most favorable in the history of the language, for its poetry. Without entering on the question of inspiration, or being too curious as to the causes of their power, we probably give the opinion of most Christians in giving our own, that these strains, through the medium of the plain English translation, do make a deeper impression on the heart, than any other religious poetry, ancient or modern. They are older than criticism, and have all the merits of that age. The images with which they abound are taken directly from nature and not borrowed from older poets, and are the proper garment of the thoughts. It is the poetry of a lover of nature in the morning of civilization. Civilization operates to draw men within doors, and to fix their eyes so much on works of art, as to hide the mountain and the desert and the sea. Then the love of nature is increased, and a higher interest given to the Psalm by the love of God. The most remarkable merit of this poetry certainly is, the lively and affectionate conception of God, which seems to imply of necessity the truth of the Jewish history, and, with whatever injurious errors it is coupled, is far the most distinct and affecting description of the Deity that is to be found, out of the New Testament and writings indebted to it.

This body of poetry has always commended itself to the Christian church as the best vehicle of devotional feeling down to a recent age. In the time of Henry the Eighth, Sternhold and Hopkins turned them into English verse; and it is a singular instance of the force of association, that the love of David could reconcile Milton to the wretchedness of the English version, and imprison even his genius in the same mean stanza. His paraphrases of some of the Psalms are still retained in the editions of his Minor Poems. It may be remarked also, that Lord Bacon had written some of the same doggrel, and so had Dr. Henry More, another of the great writers of the age of Elizabeth.

The maxim of ancient philosophy, that 'the same can only be known by the same,' may be well applied to these attempts to present the Psalms in an English metre. They require a mind of kindred character to the Psalmist. Dr. Watts has excelled all his tuneful brethren in this work, because to great power of numbers he added a very fervent piety. But it was found that the best rendering of the Psalter, however useful as a book of devotion, could very imperfectly express the wants and feelings of a modern assembly. An unwarrantable perversion of the national and local imagery of David had become necessary to give it any kind of accommodation to the present state of the Christian church. It was far better to let it sing its own songs. For this reason Hymns began to be written. We shall always regret that this class of compositions, now so important by the considerable place it fills in our public worship, did not fall into better hands. It is not fit that men of common powers should write our hymns. If every hymn to be sung in our churches could have come from the powerful and hallowed minds that have thought for the human race, and instead of being regarded as an occasional and inferior exercise, had been the vent of their best and deepest contemplations upon God and nature, these minds would have enjoyed an influence which will never be granted to their epics and books of philosophy or criticism. It is the well known saying of a distinguished statesman, 'Let who will make the laws of a people; give me the making of their songs.' So it is not the Bodies of Divinity, nor the ablest religious works, whether in prose or verse, that can ever hope to enter into the heart and faith of a nation, like the familiar religious song that is in their mouth

every Sunday, aided in its effect by the reverence of the Bible, the power of music, the associations of the place, and the sympathy of a congregation. Milton should have written hymns for those who speak the English tongue; and whatsoever sublime bard has sung to any people, could best have instructed them by doing this office.

But whilst we say what might have been done, and what we hope will yet be done, we do not undervalue the simple and pious strains which are now used in the church, bequeathed to us by so many excellent men. Many of our hymns possess great merit, and the Collection which has called our attention to this subject, has shown us that this department of sacred literature is richer than we supposed. Every lover of religious poetry probably thinks he can make a better hymn-book than any one he has seen; but our own confidence in this proposition has been somewhat shaken by the examination of Mr. Greenwood's work. It contains five hundred and sixty hymns, selected with taste and judgment from various and some of them rather unfrequented sources. It is both older and newer than other works of the same kind, inasmuch as it contains more of the ancient hymns than former compilations, whilst it is enriched by many selections from Bishop Heber, and from Montgomery and other living poets. It is an excellence of this book, that it contains a large number of hymns composed in a strain of fervent piety and peculiarly adapted to Christian worship. Of this character are the hymns selected from the Moravian and the Methodist Collections. We quote the following verses, which are taken from Wesley's Collection.

'My God, my strength, my hope,
On thee I cast my care,
With humble confidence look up,
And know thou hear'st my prayer.
Give me on thee to wait,
Till I can all things do;
On thee, almighty to create,
Almighty to renew.

'I want a sober mind,
A self-renouncing will
That tramples down and casts behind
The baits of pleasing ill;

A soul inured to pain,
To hardship, grief, and loss,
Bold to take up, firm to sustain
The consecrated cross.

'I want a godly fear,
A quick discerning eye,
That looks to thee when sin is near,
And sees the tempter fly;
A spirit still prepared,
And armed with jealous care,
For ever standing on its guard,
And watching unto prayer.

'I want a true regard,
A single, steady aim,
Unmoved by threatening or reward,
To thee and thy great name;
A zealous, just concern
For thine immortal praise;
A pure desire that all may learn
And glorify thy grace.'—*Hymn* 284.

We are very glad to find the fine hymn from Cowper, beginning

'To keep the lamp alive,
With oil we fill the bowl;
'T is water makes the willow thrive,
And grace that feeds the soul.

'The Lord's unsparing hand
Supplies the living stream;
It is not at our own command,
But still derived from him.'—*Hymn* 323.

There are some hymns of that decided merit that pleases every taste. The noble 'Te Deum' of Patrick, the versions of Addison or Marvell; Miss Williams's Hymn, entitled 'Devotion;' Mrs. Barbauld's version of Habakkuk, iii. 17—19; the best known verses of Watts and of Doddridge; and the fine old hymn, annually sung to the tune of St. Martin's in University Hall at Cambridge,—'Give ear, my children, to my law,' &c., are of this class; and, except the last, which we are sorry to miss, are retained in the present Collection. Most of those hymns which every lover of psalmody looks for, he will probably find. It is, in our eyes, an addi-

tional recommendation of this book, that the interpolations which have been thrust into the hymns of Watts and Doddridge, sometimes making the dead and defenceless poet say what he would abhor to say, are here exchanged for the genuine readings. And besides the justice, the poetry commonly gains by the restoration. The following beautiful verses of Watts, among others, are restored to their original simplicity and pathos.

'Welcome, sweet day of rest,
That saw the Lord arise;
Welcome to this reviving breast,
And these rejoicing eyes!

'The King himself comes near,
And feasts his saints to-day;
Here we may sit, and see him here,
And love, and praise, and pray.

'One day amidst the place
Where my dear Lord hath been,
Is sweeter than ten thousand days
Of pleasurable sin.

'My willing soul would stay
In such a frame as this;
And sit and sing herself away
To everlasting bliss.' — *Hymn* 26.

ART. IV. — Professor STUART's *Appendix* to his *Exegetical Essays on several Words relating to Future Punishment.* Andover. 1830. 12mo.

[A Letter.]

SINCE the publication of my Letter in the Examiner for September, 1830, I have seen Professor Stuart's Appendix to his 'Exegetical Essays on several Words relating to Future Punishment.' In this Appendix, he offers remarks on the Letter above mentioned; from which remarks, I make the following extract; — 'He [the present writer] still maintains (p. 26), as he first did, that "αἰών means *spirituality*, in the more ancient Greek," and that "the Seventy probably used it in a kindred sense in their version."

'In opposition to this, I shall merely state, that no *classic* Lexicon within the range of my consultation, gives such a sense to the word. Passow's Lexicon, the last and best of all, does not even advert to it. I have never met with it in any classic Greek writer; and consequently I must believe, that no such meaning ever was attached to it in ancient Greek, until I see some *evidence* of it; for no evidence has Mr. G. even attempted to offer.'

A few years ago, this declaration from Professor Stuart, would have been, in my mind, proof positive, and all-sufficient, that the sense of αἰών in question could not be found in any classic Lexicon of authority, or in any classic Greek writer. I should have believed, at once, that no meaning ever existed in so important a word, which had not met the eye of this distinguished critic. I doubt not, there are many, to whom the above declaration will now come with a similar influence. His name is great, and deservedly so; and his mere declaration, 'I have never seen this or that meaning, in this or that important word,' is equivalent, throughout a very extensive portion of the theological world, to a positive assertion, and trustworthy evidence, that no such meaning exists, or ever has existed, in the term in question. I speak thus, not wholly from speculation, but in a good measure from personal experience. Most cheerfully do I confess myself indebted for many valuable views of scriptural truth, to hints suggested, and to statements made in his publications. My confidence in his learning, integrity, and spiritual power has been scarcely surpassed by that of the personal disciple who sitteth at his feet. But, in the present case, I differ from him entirely; and his above-quoted declaration comes to me with a very different aspect, and conveys a very different impression, from what it would once have done. I see in it, now, no further evidence, that a sense of *spirituality* was not attached to αἰών in the more ancient Greek, than that one eminent critic has never seen it. I receive his words, above produced, as simply a magnanimous confession, that he does not know of any such meaning in the word; an honorable assurance of his readiness to hear evidence upon the subject; and by implication, a high-minded promise, that, if competent evidence be produced, he will believe.

I quote further from the same Appendix the following;— 'In page 25 *seq.*, Mr. G. argues, after all, that the principal ground of investigating the true apostolic use of *αἰώνιος*, is the the use of it by the Seventy, who regarded it as being correspondent to the Hebrew עולם. I accept the terms of contest here proposed, at once, and enter the lists with entire readiness.' Whether Professor Stuart has quoted my exact words, or not, is of but little consequence. If I apprehend him right, he has stated my true meaning, and marked out a fair field. I enter it willingly; and take up the gage as readily as he has thrown it down. Let it be ascertained in what sense the Seventy employed *αἰὼν* or *αἰώνιος*, and then it is granted that these words were employed in similar meanings in the New Testament; with the proper allowance for the difference of time, circumstance, and change of language, between the Seventy and the Apostles. On this ground, I am willing to meet the struggle, and abide the issue.

The true object, therefore, is, to investigate the sense, in which the Seventy made use of *αἰὼν* or *αἰώνιος*, in their version of the Scriptures. But how is this investigation to be made? Certainly not by merely appealing to the meaning assigned to עולם, by the Lexicons, and then arguing, as a thing of course, that the Seventy must have employed *αἰὼν* and *αἰώνιος* in the same sense. These Lexicons themselves are but works of yesterday, compared with the Septuagint. They are continually appealing to that volume for evidence of the correctness of their own definitions of the Hebrew words corresponding to its Greek words. It is one of the principal authorities on which they rely for the support of their own definitions. 'And without all contradiction, the *less* is blessed of the greater.' Of as great value, therefore, as the Lexicons are, the Greek Scriptures are greater than they. The Greek Scriptures are, in effect, the most valuable Lexicon of ancient Hebrew now extant.

In order to ascertain the sense in which the Seventy made use of *αἰὼν* or *αἰώνιος*, in their version, the appeal must be made, in the first instance, to the meaning of the words in the ordinary Greek of their age. For they would not have made use of them for translating עולם, unless they believed that this Hebrew word sustained a sense similar to that which they sustained in Greek. It would be an unjust and cruel reproach upon their moral honesty, to believe otherwise; for

it would be charging them with an intention to deceive their readers; which is not to be admitted.

Should it however be supposed, or even suspected, that they employed these Greek words in their version, in some peculiar Hebrew sense; then an ultimate appeal must be made to the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, for the true meaning of עולם, to be afterwards reflected back upon *αἰὼν* and *αἰώνιος*, according to the circumstances of each individual instance. But, in that case, the investigation must be made on the principle which Professor Stuart has followed in investigating the meaning of שאול [Sheol]. 'I have,' he says, 'simply followed, as my custom is, the *Concordance*, and endeavoured, in each case, to determine the meaning of the word שאול, from the connexion in which it stands.' The same custom must, sooner or later, be followed in regard to עולם; a method of investigation, of which the result is not to be feared. But the present concern is with *αἰὼν* and *αἰώνιος*, as employed by the Seventy; and the first object must be to ascertain the meaning of these words in the ordinary Greek of their age. For the meaning of the words in such Greek is *primâ facie* evidence of the sense in which they are employed in the Greek Scriptures.

Before proceeding further in this inquiry, it may be well, if not necessary, to state, that I assume, as correct, the following particulars;—

1. The date of the *volume*, called the Septuagint,* may be assigned at not far from three hundred years before Christ; perhaps a little later, but not so much so as to have any material influence, at least in the present inquiry.

2. Portions of the Scriptures were translated into Greek at an earlier period than the above; probably, not long after the return from the Babylonish captivity, for the use of the Jews 'scattered abroad' among nations speaking Greek.

3. The Pentateuch was the earliest translated.

4. The earlier translations were probably embodied into the volume, and together with the later ones, compose the book now called the Septuagint.

5. The term, THE SEVENTY, in reality means no more than

* The whole subject of the Septuagint, its date, &c., is amply and satisfactorily discussed in Prideaux' Connection, Vol. III. Part II Book i.

the *persons* who translated any part of the Scriptures into Greek, and whose translations are preserved in the Septuagint; whether they performed their portion of the work at an earlier or a later date; whether they were solitary individuals, or associated in a body.

6. These translators were Greek *scholars.* Jews or Gentiles, they must have been acquainted with Greek literature; or they could not have been competent to the work of translation.

7. In translating, they made use of Greek words in a classical sense wherever they could.

8. In selecting a Greek word to represent a Hebrew word, they selected one which sustained, in true Greek, a general meaning, as near as might be, to the sense which they believed to exist in the Hebrew word.

9. In translating a Hebrew word sustaining several meanigns, they selected for the purpose, as nearly as possible, a Greek term sustaining the same different senses.

10. Their Greek words ought to be understood in their classical sense, unless it should be in evidence that they employed them, in the instances in question, in some peculiar Hebrew-Greek sense; due allowance being made for the different idiom of the two languages, and for those shades of difference which exist in words most nearly correspondent to each other in different languages.

11. The Seventy *uniformly* employ *αἰὼν* or *αἰώνιος* to represent what they understood עולם to signify in Hebrew; so uniformly, that to all purposes of the present investigation it may be said they *always* do so.

12. There are terms in the Greek language which express *eternity* and *eternal*, besides *αἰὼν* and *αἰώνιος*, whether these latter express these ideas or not. But those other terms are never employed in translating עולם.

I do not believe that any of the above propositions will be denied. They have, indeed, more the air of truisms than of postulates. Should you however doubt any of them, lay aside whatever argument may be founded on what is doubted, until you see the evidence in its support; and if the evidence be not satisfactory, reject such argument altogether. For the present I assume them as granted premises, and arrive at the following state of the case; — The Seventy met

with the word עולם in the Hebrew Scriptures; they selected *αἰὼν* and *αἰώνιος*, as the proper terms by which to translate it; they adhered to these words for this purpose with a scrupulous pertinacity. The inference is direct, that they believed this Hebrew term to bear an import, as nearly equal to that of these Greek words in classical Greek, as the idiom of the two languages would admit. Whatever then was the import of *αἰὼν* or *αἰώνιος* in true Greek in their age, we must believe that such was the meaning of עולם in their minds, and (considering their favorable circumstances) that such was its true meaning, with proper allowances as above stated.

As the adjective *αἰώνιος* depends entirely for its meaning on the noun *αἰὼν*, I shall, for this and another reason, hereafter to be assigned, make no further mention at present of *αἰώνιος*, but shall speak of the noun alone, as comprehending both. You will be satisfied of the propriety of so doing hereafter.

The main object now is, to ascertain the meaning of *αἰὼν* in true Greek, in the days of the Seventy. There are three principal sources of evidence on this subject; namely, *etymology*, *lexicography*, and the actual *usage* of this word as it occurs in writers of their times, and those writers of preceding ages, whose works were then extant, and were among the still approved classics then in common use.

As I shall have frequent occasion to mention Greek writers and writings of a date anterior to that of the Seventy, or of their times, I will take the liberty to call such writers and writings and the Greek of those ages by the name *ancient*, in contradistinction to those of subsequent ages.

I have asserted, in substance, and I now repeat it distinctly, that *αἰὼν*, in *ancient* Greek, sustained, among other meanings, a sense of *spirituality*. It signified *the principle of life, vitality, the breath, the spirit*. These are not the only meanings of *αἰὼν*, but they are among its meanings. It is requisite for me to prove the above assertions; and it is my present purpose to present such evidence as I have. In doing this, I shall be led to take a view of the general conditions and habits of this word, among the existing writings of those periods. And, if the discussion have no other effect, it may at least do something towards elucidating the meanings which *αἰὼν* did sustain in those periods; some of which meanings are scarcely alluded to by modern writers, and are not even hinted at by Professor Stuart.

My FIRST evidence for a sense of spirituality in αἰὼν is ETYMOLOGY. The etymology of αἰὼν as obviously assigns it a *spiritual* sense, as does that of any Greek word whatever, employed in a spiritual meaning. The Greek language is well known to pay great respect to the etymology of its terms; as much so, perhaps, as the Hebrew itself. There is scarce a word in ancient Greek which may not be clearly traced to its root, and have the general cast of its character discovered thereby. In investigating the meaning of αἰὼν, therefore, its derivation is a matter of much consequence, and ought to be ascertained in the beginning. It will, at least, afford much help in showing what its meaning may be expected to be.

It has often been affirmed, that αἰὼν is compounded of ἀεὶ and ὤν, which words are usually understood to signify *always existing*.* Concerning the component terms of this word there is some doubt. It may have been thus composed; or it may have arisen more immediately from the verb ἀΐω, and more naturally than have been formed by the composition of two terms. But admitting that the component terms are correctly stated, still the meaning commonly assigned to αἰὼν from its supposed origin is very doubtful.

Lennep, in his 'Etymologicum Linguæ Græcæ,' gives some account of αἰὼν and words connected with it, from which I will make some extracts; believing that the etymology of this word and its cognates cannot be better presented, than in the words of this distinguished critic, or his coadjutor and editor, translated into English as follows.

'Ἄω, *flo, spiro,*' [to blow, to breathe.]

'Ἀεὶ, *semper,* [*always.*] Its origin is the verb ἄω,' [*flo, spiro,* to blow, to breathe]. 'But it seems, that from the sense of *breathing,* in very many derivatives of this verb, a transfer has been made to *duration* of time.'—'But ἀεὶ is, properly, a sort of ancient *dative* of the masculine noun ἀεὶς, in place of which the more lengthened form αἰεὶς has given rise to the *neuter* αἰὲν in same manner as ἓν is formed from εἷς. But αἰὲν and αἰεὶ, in the poets, is the same as ἀεὶ in vulgar use, *semper*' [*always*]. — 'The root is ἄω, properly, *to breathe,* &c. Therefore ἀεὶ is, properly, *by a breathing* [spiratione], that is, *gentle procession,* and sort of *perpetual efflux*

* It is not improbable that this opinion concerning the composition of αἰὼν, has been admitted in consequence of what has been thought to be the meaning of Aristotle, *De Cœlo,* lib. i. cap. 9, which passage will be hereafter produced, and can speak for itself.

of time, and so *duration* not *interrupted; αἰὲν* indeed is said for *κατὰ αἰὲν, through breathing*, or flowing, time, &c. [*per* tempus *spirans*, effluens, &c.]'

In regard to *ἄω*, the primitive word, I select the following, under *Ἀάζω*.

'It arises, without doubt, from *ἄω*. For, by the rules mentioned, it is plain, that it is not *primitive*. The verb *ἀάω*, therefore, arises proximately from *ἄω*; and thence *ἀάζω*. But *ἄω* is *to breathe;* and, as we shall hereafter see, appears to have been employed, *properly*, with respect to a *gentle breathing* [leni spiritu] of the mouth, or *halitus*, nearly such as is given forth in pronouncing the letter *a*.'

'*Αἴω* is from the more simple *ἄω*, as we have seen above, in *ἀάζω*, and *ἄζω*. Our *ἀΐω* properly indeed follows the meaning of the verb *ἄω*, and signifies *to blow*, *to breathe* [flare, spirare]; whence, sometimes by the poets, it has been used for *to breathe out*, or *expire*, [efflare]. Further, from the *breath* [spiritu] of the mouth, it is transferred to the *animal life*, and so, to the *senses* of the animal body, and is the same as *to perceive*, [sentio]. From the body, again, according to common custom, having been transferred to the mind, it answers to *intelligere* [to understand] of the Latins. —*Αἴω* is used by Homer for *to hear* and *to understand*. The proper force is *to perceive*, [sentio]. The word is written *ἀΐω* with a resolution of the diphthong, also *αἴω*, whence *αἴσω*, *αἴσθω*, *αἴσθος*, *αἴϑη*, and *αἰσθάω*, *αἰσθάνω*, *αἰσθάνομαι*, *to perceive* [sentio]; and thus all the *senses* of man are called *αἰσθήσεις*. This is the reason why *ἀΐω*, is used not only concerning the *bodily senses*, hearing, sight, &c., but also concerning the *intellect*.'

'*Αἰών, ævum, æternitas*,' [age, eternity]. 'It is a noun of that kind, which, in its own nature, denotes *collection*, and *multitude* of things, as appears from the termination *ων*.' — 'But, as we have seen in the word *ἀεὶ*, that it has been with great propriety transferred to the signification of *time*, from that of *blowing* or *breathing*, which is in the original *ἄω*; so in our *αἰών*, the same mode of transfer takes place; so that it may signify a sort of *collection* or *multitude of times*. From which proper signification again have been produced those by which the ancients have described either *age* [ævum], or eternity [æternitatem], or *the age of man* [hominis ætatem].' — 'From our Greek *αἰών*, the Æolic digamma being interposed, *αἰϝών* is produced, and hence the Latin Ævum.'

In regard to the force and effect of the termination *ων*, Lennep lays down the following general rule under *ἀγκών*.

'Nouns ending in *ών*, formed from other nouns, are *collective*, or they denote an abundance of those things which are designated

by the primitive, as are δενδρὼν, a *grove*, from δένδρον; ἐλαιὼν, an olive yard, from ἔλαιον,' &c.

I believe it will be acknowledged that the etymology of αἰὼν and its cognates is correctly traced by this writer, as above represented. I have made the extracts so much at large, because it was desirable to exhibit, as near as might be, in one view, this whole family of words.

Now on the supposition that αἰὼν, according to the common opinion, is compounded of ἀεὶ and ων, then, if applied to *time*, it would signify a multitude of *periods* or *times* united to each other;* *duration* indefinitely continued. Its proper force, in reference to *duration*, seems to be more that of *uninterrupted* duration than otherwise; a term of which the duration is *continuous* so long as it lasts, but which may be completed and finished; as *age*, *dispensation*, *sæculum*, in a general sense. If applied to *breath*, it would signify a *multitude of breathings*, or *breathing indefinitely extended;* and, if applied to simple *existence*, it would signify *existence indefinitely extended.* Some instances of its employment with respect to these subjects will be produced hereafter.

But it is not necessary to form αἰὼν by a composition of ἀεὶ and ων. It may arise much more naturally and more in the common order of things, from the verb ἀΐω. It need only be its present active participle converted into a substantive, according to the common usage of the Greek language. In this case it would signify primitively, *a breathing existence;* and by the uniform sympathies of language must, almost necessarily in process of time, be used to represent the *living soul*, whose presence in the body is made known more by the continuous breath of the mouth, than by any other means, and thence onward to any thing relating to the soul, *spiritual things.* 'From the breath of the mouth again, according to common custom, being transferred to the soul,' it would correspond to the *intelligens* of the Latins, and signify an *intelligent being*, or rather a *percipient existence;* that is, a *spirit.* As ἀΐω signifies *to perceive;* so αἰὼν, if its participle, must signify *perceiving* [sentiens]. I perceive, indeed, that Professor Stuart has denominated this from ἀΐω, 'a mistaken derivation of the word'; and while I exhibit it as that which is probable, I will not 'institute a strife' to maintain it. He

* 'The comprehension of many *times* or *periods*.' — *Phavorinus.*

will not deny it to be the *possible* derivation. Inquirers can judge for themselves whether it be the real one or not. In either case the original root is the verb ἄω, which signifies *to breathe.*

But, in every human language, some word originally representing *breath* has always been subsequently employed to represent the *principle of life*, the *living spirit*, and *the soul.* The transition is so immediate, one may say, so unavoidable, from 'the breath of life in the nostrils,' to the invisible spiritual existent within, that there is no language, in which terms originally relating to the breath have not also been employed to represent the *spirit*, and things relating to the spirit. In the Greek language there is scarcely a word employed in this signification, which may not ultimately be traced to a root associated with the breath. Even ψυχὴ itself, one of the most common names of the *principle of life* and the *soul*, derives its whole etymological right to a spiritual meaning from the same source. It is derived from ψύχω, *to breathe;* and thence the transition is made to the living existent within the material body; an existent, however, which may forsake the house of its 'earthly tabernacle,' and take possession of a new place of abode, a new sphere and mode of action, new means of perception, and instruments of operation, and still be its continuous self; 'having a consciousness of its own identity through an entire existence, [τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα.]'

Let αἰὼν, therefore, be derived proximately from ἀΐω; or be it formed by the composition of ἀεὶ and ων, still in either case its ultimate origin is ἄω, *to breathe;* and it is the very word which the ordinary and necessary customs of language would assign to represent the living and invisibly breathing *spirit.* A sense of spirituality breathes in the word itself. A more appropriate word could scarcely have been chosen to represent the *secret*, *spiritual* existent, which mysteriously inhabits and actuates the material fabric of the body of flesh. Like the Hebrew רוח it would express both the breath of the mouth and the *secret* existence within, which is continually inhaling and exhaling the vital air. Trace the descent of αἰὼν through whichever channel you will, its etymology is direct, and assigns it a *spiritual* meaning, as clearly as does that of the common terms in Greek, sustaining the same signification. It is universally granted, that πνεῦμα is employed in Greek to signify *spirit*, because it is derived from πνῦμαι,

and ultimately from πνέω, *to breathe*. A correspondent derivation assigned a correspondent sense to ψυχή. But etymology does not more decisively assign a spiritual meaning to either of these words than it does to αἰών. The latter has from etymology as good a right to this meaning as either of the former. From the frequent employment also, of so many of the cognates of αἰών in senses relating to the *mind, perception*, and similar things, it would seem that its claim to a spiritual meaning was earlier than that of πνεῦμα and superior to it. In truth, although this be not the precise place for stating it, yet the fact is, that αἰών occurs in the extant classical Greek in the senses of *the vital principle, the breath, the spirit*, some centuries before πνεῦμα occurs in them at all. The evidence of this will be produced in due time.

Thus far concerning the etymology of αἰών. Etymology, I am aware, is not conclusive evidence of the meaning of words. It affords valuable hints of what the import of particular terms may be expected to be. It helps to unfold the ancient sense of words in the ancient literature of an ancient language, and bears an important part in the balance of probabilities respecting the meaning of words. But after all, it does not afford that positive evidence which would justify us in affirming with certainty this or that to have been the indisputable meaning of any particular term. Words change their meaning; oftentimes so much in the course of a few generations, that the etymological sense of a term may have been the true one among writers of one age, while among those a century or two later it may sustain a very different import. After etymology has borne its witness, we must next appeal to those other evidences in the case, which are more important and more decisive than this. But as etymology naturally comes first in order, I have therefore presented this as my *first* authority for a spiritual meaning of αἰών in ancient Greek. Its etymology leads directly and almost necessarily to such a sense. It remains that we ascertain whether lexicography and usage support this meaning. If these concur in their testimony with that of etymology, we have then the best evidence to the meaning of a word, and evidence which is all-sufficient.

My SECOND evidence of a sense of spirituality in αἰών is LEXICOGRAPHY. I willingly admit that the most modern classical lexicographers, so far as I have consulted them, do not

directly assign the meaning *spirit* to αἰών. But every modern lexicon, which I have consulted, does assign, as one of its meanings, *vita, life*, as a meaning distinct from *tempus vitæ, time of life*. It will not be disputed, I trust, that the English word *life* corresponds precisely to the Latin *vita*. Whatever meanings, therefore, belong to the term *life* in our own language, the same belong to αἰών in the Greek; according to the unanimous testimony of modern lexicographers. Such at least is the testimony of all who have fallen within my reach, whether classical or biblical. Now, I submit it to any man of plain common sense, be he unlearned or a scholar, whether there is no sense of *spirituality* in the English word *life*. Just so much as there is, there is by all witnesses so much of the same in the Greek αἰών. We often make use of the term *life*, indeed, in the sense of the *time of life*, or *period of the duration* of human existence. But this is not its original meaning, nor even its *most* common one. It as frequently, or more so, signifies the *state* or *condition* of human existence, without reference to a longer or shorter duration; the particular *state* in which any one is during the whole or part of his human existence; the *vital principle* or *inexisting power* which maintains the motions of life, (a very near approach to the soul, if it be not the soul itself.) We apply the same term, *life*, to the existence of disembodied beings. We speak of the *life of spirits*, whether good or evil, and even the *life* of the Divine Being himself; and we do not mean *term of duration* by it, but *state* or *condition, mode* or *habit of thought, feeling, or action*, or the *indwelling principle of existence*. And we never hesitate to employ the same word *life*, when we speak of the *condition of mind*, the *spiritual* state and habit of any individual. We call it his *life*. This illustration might be pursued to a much greater extent. But what is said is sufficient to show, that when lexicographers assign *vita, life*, as one of the meanings of αἰών, they assign it, among others, a sense of *spirituality*. It is almost surprising that this should have escaped the notice of Professor Stuart; for I cannot imagine him guilty of the meanness of asserting, that no classic lexicon within his knowledge gives the meaning of *spirituality* to αἰών, because they do not define it by that very word, if he were at the same time conscious that they define it by another word sustaining so much of that sense as the word *life*.

He must have hastily overlooked it; and has thereby made it necessary to produce this evidence.

But notwithstanding the most modern lexicographers testify to no further sense of spirituality in *αἰὼν*, than what is contained in the term *life;* the more ancient ones bear witness to it more extensively.

Hesychius, a lexicographer of either the fourth or sixth century, is the oldest to which I have had access. His definition of *αἰὼν* is very short, and makes no allusion whatever to any sense of *eternity* in this word. I extract from it the following, as all that relates to the present inquiry;—

Αἰὼν, ὁ βίος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ τῆς ζωῆς χρόνος..... Εὐριπίδης δὲ Φιλοκτήτῃ, Αἰῶνα τὴν ψυχὴν λέγει·

ἀπέπνευσεν αἰῶνα.

'*Αἰὼν, the life of man, the time of life.....* Euripides, in Philoctetes, calls *αἰὼν* the *soul*, "he breathed out the *soul*" [or the *spirit*];' or in simple English, 'he gave up the ghost.'

From Hesychius then it appears, that Euripides employed *αἰὼν*, on one occasion at least, in the same sense with *ψυχὴ*, *soul.* This must, therefore, have been one of the meanings of this word in the days of that poet. It of course contained as much of a spiritual sense as does the English word *soul;* than which it would be difficult to find a word in our language sustaining more of such a meaning.

It ought also to be remembered, that notwithstanding Hesychius gives us only one instance from Euripides of the use of *αἰὼν* in the sense of the *soul*, yet we have remaining only a small proportion of the works of Euripides. We have an account of more than eighty of his tragedies, while there are extant only nineteen. Even the Philoctetes, from which Hesychius makes his quotation, is itself lost. A single witness is, in such a case, of *extensive* value; for it affords a fair inference, that, if all the works of Euripides were accessible, other cases of a similar use of this word would appear. At any rate it proves the meaning in question to have existed in his age, and presents the instance in which it may be found in the words of one classic Greek writer; although it appear only through the medium of a fragment preserved in a lexicon. It proves that Euripides understood *αἰὼν* to signify, among other things, the *soul.* And what is lexicography but testimony of the sense in which writers or speakers employ

words? The most trust-worthy is that which gives the most correct account of such actual *usage*; not that which assigns meanings to words in an arbitrary manner upon personal authority alone.

I next appeal to Phavorinus, a lexicographer of the sixteenth century; some centuries to be sure subsequent to Hesychius, but yet not so late as to be ranked among the *most* modern. His authority I trust will be admitted as good, for it is very frequently quoted by the later writers, as that in which they place confidence. He gives a description of the meanings of *αἰὼν* at great length. I make the following extracts from it as sufficient to exhibit his mind, so far as the present inquiry is concerned, observing that the second member of his definition is taken *verbatim* from the 'Etymologicon Magnum,' a work of the ninth or tenth century.

Αἰὼν, ... ὁ χρόνος, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ, καὶ ὁ βίος. . . . . Λέγεται καὶ ἀντὶ τῆ ζωή. Ὅμηρος, ἔπειτά με καὶ λείποι αἰὼν, ἤγουν ζωή. ἢ αἰὼν ζωή. . . . . Ἄλλως·

Αἰὼν, ἡ ζωὴ θηλυκῶς. Ὅμηρος, Αὐτὸς δὲ φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμερθείς. παρὰ τὸ ἄειν τὸ πνέειν. καὶ ἄημα, τὸ πνεῦμα. . . . . καὶ ἔμπνουν δὲ τὸν ζῶντα φαμέν. . . . . αἰὼν, καὶ ὁ ἀΐδιος καὶ ἀτελεύτητος, ὡς τῷ Θεολόγῳ δοκεῖ.

'*Αἰὼν, ... Time*, also *Life*, also *Habit or Way of Life*. . . . . It is also said instead of *Life*. Homer, "afterwards let EXISTENCE [*αἰὼν*] forsake me," i. e. *Life*; or, *αἰὼν* is *Life*. . . . . Otherwise;

'*Αἰὼν* is *Life*, femininely. Homer, "thyself shalt be despoiled of dear EXISTENCE [*αἰῶνος*]"; from *ἄω*, to breathe; and the SPIRIT is breath. . . . . and we, also, call the *inspiring* the *living*. . . . . *αἰὼν* is, also, the *eternal* and *endless*, as it seems to the Theologian.'

Here I strongly suspect is the true secret brought to light, of the origin of the sense of *eternity* in *αἰὼν*. The theologian first thought he perceived it, or else he placed it there. The theologian keeps it there now. And the theologian will probably retain it there longer than any one else. Hence it is, that-those lexicographers who assign *eternity* as one of the meanings of *αἰὼν* uniformly appeal for proofs to either theological, Hebrew, or Rabbinical Greek, or some species of Greek subsequent to the age of the Seventy, if not subsequent to the age of the Apostles, so far as I can ascertain. I do not know of an instance in which any lexicographer has produced the usage of *ancient* classical Greek, in evidence

that *αἰὼν* means *eternity*. I do not believe he could find a case to this purpose there. This constant habit of the later lexicographers, together with the *ὡς τῷ Θεολόγῳ δοκεῖ* of Phavorinus, and those who lived six or seven centuries before him, clearly indicates the source at which we must seek the origin of the sense of *eternity* in this word. Ancient classical Greek rejects it altogether.

As to a spiritual meaning in *αἰὼν*, according to Phavorinus, in connexion with the more ancient work, whose definition he adopts, the expressions are about equal to a positive assertion, that *αἰὼν* is a synonyme of *ἄημα* [breath] and *πνεῦμα* [SPIRIT], if I have translated them correctly. There is an ambiguity in many of his expressions which renders it difficult always to translate them so as to avoid all liability to objection. The sentence to which I refer admits of being translated in the more positive form — 'also *breath*, the SPIRIT.' I have adopted the first mode of translation, because I think it most likely that such was the meaning of the author; and I have no disposition to catch at a *word* to be turned to a self-serving sense. From the general air and aspect of this description of *αἰὼν*, and from the mode in which these terms are employed, there cannot be a doubt that he was contemplating *πνεῦμα* [SPIRIT], as a fair word for expressing one of the meanings of *αἰὼν*. Particularly when we perceive that the main reason for assigning to *αἰὼν* the meaning, *life*, is that it refers back to *ἄω to breathe*, and that *ἄημα*, *breath*, is synonymous with *πνεῦμα*, SPIRIT.

Indeed, there is no small measure of *spirituality* in *ζωὴ* [*life*], as Phavorinus employs that word in his definition of *αἰὼν*, and as it is used by ancient Greek writers. He evidently means by it something different from *βίος*. I have translated it *life*, on account of the comprehensive character of this English word, and its correspondence to the Greek *ζωὴ* and the Latin *vita*; and I have taken one from among the many meanings of *βίος* by way of distinguishing the one word from the other. But *ζωὴ* [*life*] in ancient Greek, is a word of most extensive import. It signifies much more than the mere *principle of vitality*, spiritual as that principle is. Aristotle furnishes a striking description of the extensive import of *ζωὴ* [*life*], in the following powerful passage; —

---

* *Ἐνέργεια*, inward, self-comprehended *power* and *action*.

'The energy* of mind indeed is *life* [ζωή]; and he [God] is this energy. And this energy in itself is his *life* [ζωὴ] most excellent and eternal. And we say, that God is a *living being* [ζῶον], eternal and most excellent. So that *life* [ζωὴ] and an *existence* continuous and eternal appertain to God; for this is God.' — *Arist. Met.* lib. XIV. cap. 7.

In this description ζωὴ [*life*] means something more than mere *vitality*. It signifies *spirituality* in the most decisive manner, and most extensive sense; for it represents the uninterrupted *spiritual* state of action, power, peace, and joy, in the Divine Mind; the whole realm of thought, affection, and efficient volition, as it is in God.

It is not for mortal man to judge, how far the deep-thinking and far-reaching soul which composed the above description of *life*, was 'from the kingdom of heaven.' We know, indeed, that he had not gone in by the only door through which we can arrive at the 'fulness of God.' But I cannot help thinking, that he had approached so near, that he could have some discernment, although comparatively indistinct, and desired to have a more clear perception, of that very thing which is described unto us by the beloved Apostle, as 'the eternal [spiritual] LIFE [ζωὴ αἰώνιος], which was with the Father, and is manifested unto us,' *in the Son*. In truth, the words of the sage are no bad commentary on those of the Apostle. The latter tells us, that 'the *life*,' that is, the life of God, 'was manifested that we might see it'; the former tells us, that 'the *energy of mind* is *life*.' It is no small evidence also, of the inspiration of the Apostles, that we find an humble, illiterate fisherman of Galilee, possessing, exhibiting, and imparting by divine grace, that which one of the brightest and wisest of human minds, in his deep speculations and far-extending feelings, acknowledged to be the MOST EXCELLENT and ETERNAL, and labored so hard to see clearly and obtain. Was there no allusion to any beyond the Hebrew race, in the mind of him who is 'THE LIFE,' when he said, 'Many prophets and *righteous men* have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them'? Is it not also, with reference to this immense sense of spirituality in the term, that the attribute of LIFE is so often appli-

ed to the Divine Being in the Scriptures, and he is so often called the LIVING God?*

But according to Phavorinus, and his copied predecessors, αἰὼν is a synonyme of ζωὴ [LIFE]; and by fair interpretation of their words it sustains a similar relation to πνεῦμα [*spirit*]. It therefore implies as much of *spirituality* as either of these; and there are no words in the English language which imply more of it.

It can hardly be, that the lexicons of Hesychius and Phavorinus have fallen within the range of Professor Stuart's consultation, or he would probably have saved me the trouble of producing them. As it is, there they are; and they testify as they may to a sense of *spirituality* in αἰὼν, in the more ancient Greek. I have had no opportunity to consult other lexicographers of former times, and indeed I see no absolute necessity of so doing. These are sufficient to prove the asserted meaning of this word, and that lexicographers of authority have so understood and affirmed it. Taking these evidences in connexion with the sense of *life*, which both ancient and modern critics almost universally declare to be in αἰὼν, a testimony of a spiritual meaning in that word is borne, which is not to be refuted by the mere silence of one or two of the most modern writers, even though they be Schneider and Passow; concerning whom I would speak with the respect due to names so highly honored by Professor Stuart, although I have no acquaintance with their works.

My THIRD evidence of a *spiritual* sense in αἰὼν is actual USAGE. This is in reality the only ultimate resort. An appeal to actual usage is the *experimentum crucis*, which must decide the question, after other authorities have been consulted to whatever extent; and it is now proposed to submit the meaning of αἰὼν in ancient Greek to this decisive trial.

If it be true, that this word in Greek writers earlier than the time of the Seventy, and till then in common use, or in writers of near their age, was employed to represent *spirit* or *spirituality*, it will follow that the Seventy would make use of it in a similar sense, whenever they judged the Hebrew to contain a similar meaning. Indeed, in whatever various meanings αἰὼν occurs in those more ancient Greek writings, we may confidently expect to find it occuring in similar meanings in the Greek Scriptures. If it be true, that αἰὼν was a

* See Harris's Hermes, Book II. Chap. 5.

word of complex significancy, and yet is uniformly employed to represent the Hebrew עולם in preference to any other Greek word of a more precise import; then we ought to believe that the Seventy perceived in עולם the same complexity of meaning, and for this cause made choice of *αἰών* for translating it; intending to leave this term in Hebrew-Greek to be understood by inquirers in any or either of the meanings which it sustained in true Greek, according to the circumstances in which עולם should appear, and the peculiar import which it should seem most evident the inspired writer intended in the particular instances to convey by it.

I am now making an appeal to the actual USAGE of *αἰών* in *ancient* Greek. It may be necessary to remind you, that by the word *ancient* in this connexion I mean the Greek existing in ages anterior to the days of the Seventy, or in their own times. It is not my purpose to confine the inquiry to the particular meaning of *αἰών* now in question. It would not be right or fair so to do. The only way in which we can make a fair investigation of any particular meaning in an ancient word is, to ascertain, so far as we can, its general habits and modes of usage in those ages, concerning which we are inquiring. We may then gather up our evidence for the particular sense in question, not from solitary and insulated passages, but as it rises and shows itself among the general habits of the word. As far, therefore, as my own examination has extended, it is my design to exhibit this word in the different connexions and circumstances in which it has appeared. Let its particular import in particular places be exhibited; its prevailing meaning will be seen in proportion to the extent of the examination; and if the *spiritual* sense for which I contend does not appear, I am quite content to give it up.

With these remarks I now affirm, that *αἰών* in *ancient* Greek was employed, in common with certain other words, to represent *existence — state of existence*, particularly *state of human existence — state*, or *condition*, or *order of things* simply — the *principle of vitality* or *life itself — vital energy — breath — spirit — soul*, most commonly without, although sometimes with reference to *date*, *period*, or *definite duration*. In some few instances it signifies a *period* or *term of time*, but they are very few; and in no case within the range of my examination does it positively signify *eternity*. The word, EXISTENCE, would express its meaning in more

instances than any other word, inasmuch as *existence* signifies that which may or may not be, is, or is not measured by time, or confined to period or place, and that which may be material or spiritual, as the case may be. For this reason, in the instances to be produced I shall translate *αἰὼν* by the word *existence* wherever it can be so done with propriety, testifying as I may what kind of *existence* I believe to be intended in any particular instance.

Some of the meanings of *αἰὼν*, above named, are incontestably *spiritual.* Indeed, some of them are 'spirit and life' itself. Most of those meanings imply a measure of spirituality, or so readily associate themselves with it, that they exhibit a kindred import; and occurring as they commonly do, with reference to *human* beings who partake of a *spiritual* nature, or with reference to higher intelligences who are altogether *spiritual*, they evince their affinity to the same spiritual family.

It now becomes requisite to prove the correctness of the above description of the meanings of *αἰὼν* in ancient Greek, by exhibiting evidences of its actual usage. I have produced such evidence as I have obtained from etymology and lexicography. Nothing now remains but for *ancient* Greek writers to speak for themselves. Before I can call them to do this with any effect, it will be necessary to name some particulars which one cannot be very desirous to publish. But the state of the present case makes it necessary; for it cannot be expected that my assertions will be believed, unless the authority be exhibited on which they are made, nor then, unless the authority be satisfactory.

I must, therefore say, that in searching for the meaning of this and some other words in ancient Greek, I have examined line by line the following works, intending and endeavouring to note every instance in which either *αἰὼν* or *αἰώνιος* occurred; — namely, Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* — Hesiod — Æschylus — Pindar (except the Fragments) — Sophocles — Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, and his treatises *de Mundo*, *de Spiritu*, *de Moribus*, *de Cœlo* — Euripides. These are not a very great proportion of ancient classics to be sure, and an extensive Greek reader may smile at the meagreness of my catalogue. But they are all to which, at my distance from any public library, I could have access. Nevertheless they are competent witnesses for the general habit, in their respective ages, of such words as they employ.

In such a research, I may have passed over some instances of the words in question; but if so, they must be very few. I however hold my testimony ready to be corrected by any one who has made or shall hereafter make a more accurate investigation. It being a desirable object to exhibit the true habit of αἰὼν in ancient Greek, it is my intention to produce every instance in which it occurs in the examined works, in such a light that its meaning may be seen.

With the reservation of the right of being corrected, as above, I may be allowed, on such authority as this personal examination may afford, to bear witness to such facts as fall within the purview of such an investigation; meaning that my testimony shall be only of that which I know, and my witness only of that which I have seen.

In order also to make the whole subject as accessible as possible to the reader unacquainted with the Greek language, I here remark, that in the following pages, passages translated from Greek writers will appear in *italic* letters, having the word corresponding to αἰὼν in small CAPITALS.

With these explanations I submit the following statements.

In Homer and Hesiod the word πνεῦμα, the most common name for *spirit* in Hebrew-Greek, according to the customary translations, does not occur at all, if my examination be correct. Πνεῦμα could hardly have existed as a word expressing *spirit* in the days of Homer or Hesiod, or they must have occasionally employed it, so often as they wished to name the spirit or soul. They in all cases make use of other words for expressing these ideas, and among them the former occasionally employs αἰὼν.

In the Iliad and Odyssey, αἰὼν occurs thirteen times only as a noun. There are some instances of ἀΐων, the participle, in the sense of *hearing*, *perceiving*, or *understanding*, in Homer and the other poets above named, which I pass by. I will now produce the instances from Homer in which it occurs as a noun, and you can judge for yourself whether my assertions concerning it are correct. I have endeavoured to arrange them according to the meaning which this word seems to bear in the individual cases. There is some difficulty in doing this; and the propriety of the arrangement may sometimes be doubted or denied. It is submitted to your candor.

In the five following instances αἰὼν signifies *human existence;* the *state of being alive among men;* but without ex-

pressing in itself the *date, period,* or *duration* of that state. It is *state* without reference to *time.*

Iliad XXII. 58. Priam endeavouring to persuade Hector to enter the city and avoid the encounter with Achilles, says, '*Thyself shall be deprived of pleasant* EXISTENCE.'

Αὐτὸς δὲ φίλης ἀιῶνος ἀμερθῇς.

Iliad XXIV. 725. Andromache lamenting over the dead body of Hector;—'*Husband, thou hast perished from* EXISTENCE, *young.*'

Ἄνερ, ἀπ' ἀιῶνος νέος ὤλεο.

In these two instances αἰὼν signifies human *existence* considered as *state* or *condition,* without alluding to its *period, term,* or *duration* in any sense. Whenever the poet intends to describe the *duration* of the existence spoken of, he adds some appropriate term, as in the three following instances.

Iliad IV. 478. '*A brief enduring* EXISTENCE.'

Μιννυθάδιος . . . . . ἀιών.

Iliad XVII. 302. The same.

Iliad IX. 415. '*My existence shall be for a long term.*'

Ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ μοι αἰὼν
Ἔσσεται.

All the sense of *duration* whether longer or shorter, which appears in the last three passages, is in the terms μιννυθάδιος and ἐπὶ δηρόν·—αἰὼν expresses no more than the *state* or *existence* alone, which in these cases is *human life.*

In the following instances αἰὼν represents the *principle of vitality* or the *spirit* 'which maketh alive.'

Iliad V. 685. '*Son of Priam, suffer me not to lie a prey to the Greeks; but save me; and afterwards let* EXISTENCE [*the* SPIRIT] *forsake me in your city.*'

Ἔπειτά με καὶ λίποι αἰὼν
Ἐν πόλει ὑμετέρῃ."

Iliad XVI. 453. Juno advises Jupiter to suffer Sarpedon to die by the hand of Patroclus, but to have him conveyed to Lycia and honorably buried,—'*after life and* SPIRIT *may leave him.*'

Ἐπὴν δὴ τόνγε λίπῃ ψυχή τε καὶ αἰών·

or as it is sometimes said in English, '*soul* and *spirit,*' meaning much the same as '*soul,* even the *spirit.*' [—'*anima et vita,* ubi utrumque idem notat.' *Damm.*]

Iliad XIX. 27. Achilles, speaking of the dead Patroclus, says; — '*The* SPIRIT *has been forced away; the body may entirely corrupt.*'

Ἐκ δ' αἰὼν πέφαται· κατὰ δὲ χρόα πάντα σαπήῃ.

Odyssey V. 152. '*His* [Ulysses] *sweet* SPIRIT *was exhausting* [or distilling] *itself through sorrowful desire of returning home.*'

Κατείβετο δὲ γλυκὺς αἰὼν
Νόστον ὀδυρομένῳ.

Ulysses was *homesick*. And, perhaps, no disease more effectually consumes the *vital energy*, or causes the *spirit* to *distil itself* in tears than this. If you doubt it, you need only read the article *Nostalgia*, in Rees's Cyclopædia, and you will be satisfied. Perhaps the *Ἴωμεν εἰς Ἀθήνας* of the Grecian exiles might not be far from exhibiting a correct view of the mind laboring under this disease; or you may see no small portion of the objects, the sight of which causes this spiritual disease in the '*Ranz des Vaches*' of the Swiss. But if you would see it as described in Scripture, I refer you to Isaiah li. 14. 'The captive exile *hasteneth*, tha the may be loosed; and that he should not die in the pit,' &c. Or Psalm cxxxvii. 1, &c. 'By the rivers of Babylon there we sat down; yea, we *wept* when we remembered Zion.'

Odyssey V. 160. '*Nor let your* SPIRIT *consume.*'

Μηδέ τοι αἰὼν
Φθινέτω.

In the same connexion with the last instance.

Odyssey VII. 224. '*Let* EXISTENCE [*the* SPIRIT] *forsake me, beholding my estate, servants, and lofty and ample house.*'

Ἰδόντα με καὶ λίποι αἰὼν
Κτῆσιν ἐμὴν δμῳάς τε, καὶ ὑψερεφὲς μέγα δῶμα.

In other words, 'Let my *soul* depart in peace when my eyes shall have seen these desirable things.'

Odyssey IX. 523. Ulysses to the Cyclops exclaims, — '*I wish I could send you to the house of Pluto, having deprived you of life* [or soul] *and* SPIRIT.'

Ψυχῆς τε καὶ αἰῶνος . . . . .
Ἐνῖνι ποιήσας.

Odyssey XVII. 203. Penelope speaks, saying; — '*O that chaste Diana would grant me now a kind death, that I may no*

longer, grieving at heart, be consuming the SPIRIT, *through intense desire of the comprehensive excellence of my beloved husband.'*

Ὀδυρομένη κατὰ θυμὸν
Αἰῶνα φθινύθω.

In plain language, Penelope was *love-sick;* a state of disease which physicians affirm to be exceedingly exhausting to the *spirit* of the human being. This being the last passage in Homer, I here remark, in reference to the whole, that Dr. S. Clark asserts, that αἰὼν is never employed in Homer in the sense of *long time.* — *Note, in Odyssey,* XVIII. 202.

I know of no other instance of αἰὼν in Homer's Iliad or Odyssey, and do not believe there is any. I assume these as all subject to correction. From these it appears, that the only meanings belonging to this word in these writings, are

1. *State of existence;* in all these cases, *human existence.*
2. The *vital principle,* or *vital energy.*
3. The *spirit.*

To one or the other of these meanings each of the above instances may be referred; and the circumstances in which the word occurs sufficiently indicate to which it belongs in each particular case. It cannot be doubted, that the meaning of αἰὼν in Homer's age was habitually of a *spiritual* cast, or that in many cases it signified the *spirit* or *living principle* itself.

I notice in Hesiod only two instances of αἰών.

Theog. 609.

Τῷ δὲ ἀπ' αἰῶνος κακὸν ἐσθλῷ ἀντιφέριζει ἔμμεναι.

'*To him* [sc. the married man] *during* EXISTENCE, *evil is continually striving to abide with good.*'

Scut. Herc. 331, if this work be allowed to Hesiod.

Λῦτ' ἂν δὴ Κύκνον γλυκερῆς αἰῶνος ἀμέρσῃς.

'*When thou mayest deprive Cycnus of sweet* EXISTENCE.'

The meaning of αἰὼν in Hesiod, is so far *spiritual* as human existence, or perhaps simple *existence,* partakes of spirituality. This is certain; — mean what it may, αἰὼν in Homer and Hesiod never means *eternity.*

In Æschylus I notice nineteen instances of αἰὼν, as follow;

Prometh. 860.

Γυνὴ γὰρ ἄνδρ' ἕκαστον αἰῶνος στερεῖ.

'*For the wife will deprive each her own husband of* EXIST-

ENCE [the vital principle].' The allusion is to the sons of Ægyptus and the daughters of Danaus.

Sept. con. Theb. 219.

Μήποτ' ἐμὸν κατ' αἰῶνα λίποι θεῶν
Ἅδε πανήγυρις.

'*Never, during my* EXISTENCE, *may this consociation of Gods depart.*'

Ibid. 744. *Αἰῶνα δ' ἐς τρίτον μένει.*

'*And it* [the punishment of ancient sin] *endureth to the third* GENERATION.'

Ibid. 774. *Πουλύβοτός τ' αἰὼν βροτῶν.*

'*And human* EXISTENCE *was prosperous.*'

Persæ, 263. *Ἦ μακροβίοτος ὅδε*
Γέ τις αἰὼν ἐφάνθη
Γεραιοῖς, ἀκούειν
Τόδε πῆμ' ἄελπτον.

'*Truly this* EXISTENCE *seems long to the old when hearing of this unexpected calamity!*'

Suppl. 47. *Ἐπωνυμίᾳ δ'*
Ἐπεκραίνετο μόρσιμος αἰὼν
Εὐλόγως.

'*By the sirname the destined* EXISTENCE *was praiseworthily completed.*'

Ibid. 570. *Ζεὺς αἰῶνος κρέων ἀπαύστου.*

'*Jupiter, lord of ceaseless* EXISTENCE.'

Ibid. 577. *Δι' αἰῶνος μακροῦ πάνολβον.*

'*Entirely happy during a long* EXISTENCE.'

Agam. 230. *Παρ' οὐδὲν αἰῶνα παρθένιον*
Ἔθεντο φιλόμαχοι βραβῆς.

'*The battle-loving warriors counted as nothing her virgin* EXISTENCE [life].'

Ibid. 249. *Εὔποτμον*
Αἰῶνα φίλως ἑτίμα.

'*She* [Iphigenia] *mildly sacrificed her blessed* EXISTENCE [soul].'

Ibid. 556. *Τίς δὲ πλὴν θεῶν*
Ἅπαντ' ἀπήμων τὸν δι' αἰῶνος χρόνον;

'*Who, excepting the Gods is free from trouble during the whole term of* EXISTENCE.'

Ibid. 716. *Παμπρόσθη πολύθρηνον*
Αἰῶν᾽ —

'*An extremely miserable* EXISTENCE [condition]' — Induced upon Troy by the marriage of Paris with Helen.

Ibid. 1150. *Περιβάλοντο γάρ οἱ πτεροφόρον δέμας*
Θεοὶ, γλυκύν τ᾽ αἰῶνα κλαυμάτων ἄτερ.

'*The Gods have granted her* [the nightingale] *a light-winged body, and a pleasant* EXISTENCE [possibly *a cheerful* SPIRIT] *free from lamentations.*'

Choëph. 24. *Δι᾽ αἰῶνος δ᾽ ἰνγμοῖσι βόσκεται κέαρ.*

'*My heart is fed with groans during* EXISTENCE [incessantly].'

Ibid. 348. *Τέκνων τε κελεύθοις*
Ἐπιστρεπτὸν αἰῶνα κτίσας.

'*Having perfected an* EXISTENCE *reflecting glory on his children's steps.*'

Ibid. 440. *Ἔπρασσε δ᾽ ἅπερ νὶν, ὧδε θαπτει·*
Μόρον θεῖναι μωμένα
Ἄφερτον αἰῶνι σῷ.

'*When she* [Clytemnestra] *had treated him* [Agamemnon] *thus, she buried him here, studious to establish his fate in thy* EXISTENCE [soul] *as a thing intolerable.*' *

Ibid. 472. *Ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν*
Αἰῶν᾽ ἀναιρεῖν.

'*To take away* EXISTENCE [LIFE] *from these.*'

Eumen. 315. *Ἀσινὴς δ᾽ αἰῶνα διοιχνεῖ.*

'*He* [who hath pure hands] *remains during* EXISTENCE *unharmed* [by the Furies].'

---

* 'Entomb'd him here, studious to make his murder
A deed of horror, that through all thy life
Might shock thy soul.' — *Potter.*

It may not be unpleasant, nor altogether useless, to compare the thought of Æschylus in this place, with that of Shakspeare in Hamlet's address to his father's spirit; —

'Remember thee?
Ay, thou poor ghost, while memory holds a seat
In this distracted globe. Remember thee?
Yea, from the table of my memory,
I 'll wipe away all trivial fond records,
All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past,
That youth and observation copied there;

Ibid. 560. *Δι' αἰῶνος δὲ τὸν πρὶν ὄλβον*
Ἕρματι προσβαλὼν δίκας,
Ἄλλεται ἄκλαυστος, αὐτος.

'*Casting for* LIFE *his former happiness upon the rock of vengeance, he perished unwept, unknown.*'

I notice also the following instance of *εὐαίων*.

Pers. 710. *Βίοτον εὐαίωνα Πέρσαις, ὡς θεὸς, διήγαγες.*

'*As a God, thou hast carried on a life, an* EXISTENCE BENIGNANT *to Persia.*'

Also the following instance of *ἀνταίων*.

Choëph. 586.

Ἀνταίων βροτοῖς. 'MALIGNANT *to mortals.*'

I believe no one will suspect that Æschylus ever imagined a sense of *eternity* to belong to *αἰών*. How far he considered it to sustain a *spiritual* import the foregoing instances may show.

In Pindar's Odes, not including the Fragments, I notice thirteen instances of *αἰών*, as follow;

Olymp. II. 18.

Αἰών τ' ἔφε-
πε μόρσιμος, πλοῦτον
Τε καὶ χάριν ἄγων
Ἰνησίαις ἐπ' ἀρεταῖς.

'*The destined* EXISTENCE *received them, conferring wealth and favor on legitimate virtues.* — *Existence* here most probably signifies *condition of life*. But it may have been intended for some *divine being*, who according to destiny took them up and blessed them with wealth and favor.

And thy commandment all alone shall live
Within the book and volume of my brain,
Unmixed with baser matter.'

The fate of the fathers is in both cases similar. It was a 'deed of horror,' which so deeply engrained itself into the thoughts and feelings of the respective sons, as to form a part of their *spiritual* existence; and Shakspeare's 'book and volume of the brain' cannot be very different from the *αἰὼν* [*existence*] of Æschylus. Some of our readers may need to be informed, that Clytemnestra had murdered her husband, Agamemnon, and treated his body with great indignity. The words above quoted from Æschylus are spoken by Electra, the daughter of the murdered king, to her brother Orestes, when making him acquainted with the circumstances of their father's death, and the barbarous treatment of his body by their mother.

Ibid. 121.

Οἵτινες ἔχαι-
ρον εὐορκίαις,
Ἄδακρυν νέμονται
Αἰῶνα.

'*They who delight in faithfulness possess a tearless* EXISTENCE.' — May it not be said, *an untroubled spirit?* — 'Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God hath anointed thee with the *oil of gladness.*'

Olymp. IX. 90.

Μὴ καθέλοι μιν αἰ-
ὼν, πότμον ἐφάψας,
Ὀρφανὸν γενεᾶς.

'*Lest* AGE, *hastening to death, should destroy him, childless.*' *Αἰὼν* here seems to signify *existence rapidly finishing itself.*

Pyth. III. 153.

Αἰὼν δ' ἀσφαλὴς
Οὐκ ἔγεντ' οὔτ' Αἰακίδᾳ παρὰ Πηλεῖ,
Οὔτε παρ' ἀντιθέῳ
Κάδμῳ.

'*An* EXISTENCE *free from peril was not allowed to Peleus the son of Æacus, nor even to the divine Cadmus.*'

Pyth. IV. 331.

Μή τινα λειπόμενον
Τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν,
Αἰῶνα πέσσοντ' —

'*Lest any one being left should remain with his mother trifling away a safe* EXISTENCE.'

Pyth. V. 8.

Κλυτᾶς
Αἰῶνος ἀκρᾶν βαθμίδων
Ἄπο.

'*From the first steps of an illustrious* EXISTENCE.'

Pyth. VIII. 139.

Λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἀνδρῶν
Καὶ μείλιχος αἰών.

'*A shining light is present, and the* EXISTENCE *of men is delightful.*' — Will you allow me to say, *the human* SOUL *is joyous?*

Nem. II. 11.

Εἴπερ . . . . νιν εὐθύπομπος
Αἰὼν ταῖς μεγάλαις δέδωκεν
Κόσμον Ἀθάναις.

'*If a rightly guiding* EXISTENCE [SPIRIT] *has given him for an ornament to great Athens.*'

Nem. III. 130.

Ἐλᾷ δὲ καὶ τέσ-
σαρας ἀρετὰς ὁ μακρὸς αἰών.

'*A long* EXISTENCE [old age] *produces the four virtues.*'

Nem. IX. 106.

Ἐκ πόνων δ', οἳ σὺν νεόταται γένωνται
Σύν τε δίκᾳ, τελέθει
Πρὸς γῆρας αἰὼν ἅμερα.

'*From labors, which are borne in youth with honor, there arises for old age an* EXISTENCE *of day*, [a happy *state*, like continual day; or if you will admit it, a SPIRIT in *daylight.*]'

Isthm. III. 29.

Αἰὼν δ' κυλινδομέναις
Ἀμέραις ἄλλ' ἄλλοτ' ἐξ-
άλλαξεν.

'EXISTENCE *by revolving days changes different things in different ways.*'

Isthm. VII. 59.

Ἔκαλος ἔπειμι, γῆρας ἔς τε τὸν μόρσιμον
Αἰῶνα.

'*I have quietly come to old age, and to the destined* EXISTENCE [condition of being].'

Isthm. VIII. 27.

Δόλιος γὰρ αἰὼν
Ἐπ' ἀνδράσι κρέμαται,
Ἐλίσσων βιότου πόρον.

'*For a deceitful* EXISTENCE [possibly SPIRIT] *overhangs mankind, urging on the course of life.*'

In Sophocles I notice the following nine instances of *αἰών*:

Electra, 1030.

Ἄσκει τοιαύτη νοῦν δι' αἰῶνος μένειν.

'*Endeavour to remain the same in mind during* EXISTENCE [as long as you live].'

Ibid. 1091. *Καὶ σὺ πάγκλαυτον αἰ-*
ῶνα κοινὸν εἵλου.

'*And thou hast constantly chosen an* EXISTENCE [state] *entirely sorrowful.*'

Ajax Flag. 657.
Ὦ τλάμων πάτερ,
Οἵαν σε μένει πυθέσθαι
Παιδὸς δύσφορον ἄταν,
Ἂν οὔπω τὶς ἔθρεψεν
Αἰὼν Αἰακιδᾶν
Ἀτερθέ γε τοῦδε.

'*Unhappy father, what a sad calamity of your son are you about to learn; such as no* EXISTENCE [no individual] *ever endured in the family of Æacus, excepting this only.*'

Antig. 589.
Εὐδαίμονες, οἷσι κακῶν
Ἄγευστος αἰών.

'*Happy are they whose* EXISTENCE [human life] *is free from evils.*'

Œdip. Colon. 1812.
Ποῖ δῆ-
τ' αὖθις ὧδ' ἔρημος, ἄπορος,
Αἰῶνα τλάμων ἔξω;

'*Where after this shall I, desolate and perplexed, sustain* EXISTENCE [human life] *in sorrow?*'

Trachiniæ, 2.
Οὐκ ἂν αἰῶν' ἐκμάθοι βροτῶν, πρὶν ἂν
Θάνοι τὶς, οὔτ' εἰ χρηστὸς, οὔτ' εἴ τῳ κακός.

'*No one can be acquainted with the* EXISTENCE *of mortals* [the human state of being], *before he may have died; whether it be good, or whether it be evil to any one.*'

Ibid. 34.
Τοιοῦτος αἰὼν εἰς δόμους τε κἀκ δόμων
Ἀεὶ τὸν ἀνδρ' ἔπεμπε λατρεύοντα τῳ.

'*Such an* EXISTENCE [state or condition], *at home and abroad, is always befalling the man who is a servant to any one.*'

Philoctetes, 179.
Ὦ δύστανα γένη βροτῶν,
Οἷς μὴ μέτριος αἰών.

'*O the unhappy race of mortals, who have not an* EXISTENCE [state] *of mediocrity.*'

Ibid. 1390.

Ὦ στυγνὸς αἰὼν, τί μ' ἔτι δῆτ' ἔχεις ἄνω
Βλέποντα, κοὐκ ἀφῆκας εἰς ᾅδου μολεῖν ;

'*Ah, odious* EXISTENCE [human life], *why dost thou still retain me living here above, and dost not suffer me to depart to the grave?*'

I notice also the following five instances of *μακραίων*, which may have some influence in elucidating the sense of *αἰών*.

Œdip. Tyr. 526.

Οὗτοι βίου μοι τοῦ μακραίωνος πόθος.

'*I have no desire of* LONG-ENDURING *life.*'

Ibid. 1118. *Τίς σ' ἔτικτε*
Τῶν μακραιώνων ;

'*Which of the* LONG-ENDURING ONES [immortals] *begot you?*'

Ajax Flag. 195.

μακραίωνι, LONG-CONTINUING.

Antigone, 999.

μοῖραι μακραίωνες, LONG-LIVED FATES.

Œd. Colon. 149.

μακραίων, OLD. 148. *δυσαίων,* WRETCHED.

Also the following three instances of *εὐαίων*.

Trachiniæ, 81.

Τὸν λοιπὸν ἤδη βίοτον εὐαίων' ἔχειν.

'*In future to have life a blessed* EXISTENCE [state].'

Philoctetes, 855.

Ὕπν' . . . . . .
. . . . . .
Εὐαίων, εὐαίων ἄναξ.

'*Oh sleep,* . . . MOST BENIGNANT *king!*'

But I have occupied as much space as can be consistently devoted to this inquiry, in one number of the Examiner. I therefore pause here, and wait for a future opportunity to proceed.

Yours, in good will,
E. S. G.

Sandwich, Feb. 7, 1831.

ART. V. — *The Works of the Rev.* ROBERT HALL, A. M. *Minister of Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, England. First complete Edition; with a Brief Memoir of the Author.* In two volumes. New York. G. & C. & H. Carvill. 1830. 8vo. pp. 439 and 491.

IT is somewhat remarkable, when we consider the reputation of Robert Hall, and the readiness of the English public to welcome and purchase the works of their eminent men, that the first and only complete collection of his writings should have been made, and that only within a few months past, in this country. We greet them with pleasure, because we have been accustomed to welcome whatever bears the name of that eloquent man. Yet we are free to confess, that some of his late controversial works have impaired the respect, which we had felt happy in entertaining for his character. Nor are we sure, that these volumes will add any thing to the permanent fame of Mr. Hall. Nay, we are even disposed to doubt whether, had he been consulted, he would have given his sanction to the whole publication. The fact, that no such collection has been made in England, and that, in one instance at least, the author himself has interdicted the reprinting of an article which on its first appearance attracted much attention, warrants our suspicion, that he had satisfactory reasons for declining it.

In truth, upon a somewhat careful survey of these volumes, and some knowledge of the feelings of the author, we do not believe, he will congratulate himself on the zeal of his American editor. Except those pieces, which are already extensively known, and have conferred upon the name of Robert Hall its deathless renown, they seem to us to contain little, which his admirers or friends would be anxious to preserve. And we find ourselves continually returning with dissatisfaction from the fugitive 'Polemics,' religious and political, which form no inconsiderable part of this 'complete edition,' and which we verily think the writer himself designed should pass away with the occasion that produced them, — to his earlier and, in our view, far higher productions. When Mr. Hall discourses of 'Infidelity,' and sets forth its presumption, madness, or ruin; — when he speaks of war with its crimes and desolations, while he inculcates

upon fellow-subjects and soldiers the 'sentiments suited to an alarming crisis'; — when he calls upon a 'nation in tears' to stand still and adore the mysterious providence of God in the sudden extinction of its loyal and most cherished hopes, as in his unrivalled discourse on the death of the Princess Charlotte; or when, in the tenderness of private affection, but in the strength also of a Christian's faith, he pours out his heart over the grave of his friend Ryland; or when in a solemn charge, he addresses lessons of evangelic wisdom to the younger Carey, about entering on a distant mission, and destined to be 'separate from his brethren' — we listen and we admire. What is much more, we are admonished, quickened, and instructed. There is a grandeur and elevation of conception, an understanding of the 'mind of Christ,' and an utterance of the true 'sayings of God,' that command not our assent only, but the best feelings of the soul. We are totally forgetful, or totally indifferent, by what name he is known, or to what party among Christians such a writer belongs. It is enough for us that he is of the truth, and of that truth which makes us free. We go to his pages again and again with fresh delight. But when this great man descends to the troubled field of controversy, and humbles himself to assail, not only what he supposes to be error, but good and upright and illustrious men who hold it, he seems to us no longer of the same nature. He breathes a tainted atmosphere. He betrays the bitterness and uncharitableness of common disputants. And we are forced, not so much in anger as in sorrow, to lament the degradation which controversy can make of the finest powers. We mourn, as did Goldsmith over the eloquent Burke, when that philosopher and scholar consented to mingle himself with the political wranglings of the day, that

> 'Born for the universe, he narrowed his mind,
> And to party gave up what was meant for mankind.'

To the works, to which we have already alluded, we shall have occasion to recur in the course of this notice. Indeed, they cannot be overlooked in any just estimate we can form of their writer. They are his glory; and in comparison of them most of his other pieces are of far inferior value. It will, therefore, be easily seen, that there are two distinct views in which Mr. Hall is to be considered, — as a preacher

and as a controversialist. The contents of these volumes also may generally be classed under the heads of practical or exhortatory, including his public Speeches as well as Sermons, and polemical, in the form of Reviews or distinct treatises. Under these heads we shall consider them.

But such of our readers, as have not already learnt, may first be desirous of knowing, something of the history of this eminent man. This is supplied in part by the editor of the collection, in a Memoir, chiefly compiled from some brief biographical sketches from foreign journals; which, though certainly wanting in the freshness of delineation that personal friendship, or nearness to the scenes of his labors, might have supplied, may furnish a sufficient account of one, whose genius and eloquence have given him a place with the most distinguished of his profession, and even with the master-spirits of his age.

Mr. Hall, as we learn from this Memoir, is the son of the Rev. Robert Hall, who was in his day an esteemed minister of the communion, known by the name of the Particular Baptists. His fine intellectual powers were early developed, so that, as his father related, he perfectly understood the reasonings in the argumentative pieces of Dr. Jonathan Edwards at the *age of nine years!* For the writings of this great metaphysician we have ourselves heard him declare his admiration. But this was mingled at the same time with expressions, in his accustomed energetic manner, of abhorrence at the theological system, which theologians of a later day have professed to build upon them. 'I cannot believe,' said he, 'that that illustrious divine would have given the sanction of his great authority to so crude a mass of presumption and error.'

The education of Mr. Hall was in some respects superior to that usually received by young men preparing for the ministry, among dissenters of his denomination in England. He was first a pupil in the academy of Dr. Ryland of Northhampton; whence he removed to Bristol, and was under the care of Dr. Caleb Evans, whose character for learning, piety, and liberality of sentiment has been held in high esteem. At seventeen, he was entered a student of King's College, Aberdeen; where, besides the other benefits of that ancient seminary, he had the privilege of attending, through his whole course, the lectures of Dr. George Campbell, the learned

Professor of Theology and Principal of Marischal College, whose valuable translation of the Four Gospels with Notes has given him a place with the most accomplished biblical critics of his own, or indeed of any other age. Here, also, our author formed an intimate friendship with Mr. (now Sir James) Mackintosh, for whose promising genius and virtues he anticipated then, what advancing years have abundantly confirmed — the highest distinction. Their friendship seems to have been truly fraternal. The letter of Sir James to his friend after the recovery of the latter from a malady, by which he has been repeatedly visited, cannot be read without lively emotion. And even during the continuance of one of those periods of mental disorder, which Mr. Hall has shared with Browne and Cowper and many other chosen spirits, one of whose most melancholy effects is the forgetfulness of past friendships or the confounding of friends with enemies, he is known to have uttered in some very characteristic terms his profound veneration for the superior wisdom and sagacity of Sir James, 'the first great man in the world, once judge of Bombay, and my classmate at Aberdeen.'

As a *preacher*, Mr. Hall early obtained the reputation by which he has ever since been honored. At Bristol, where he was first settled as colleague with his patron, Dr. Evans, as well as assistant in his academy, and afterwards at Cambridge, where he succeeded the Rev. Robert Robinson, in the charge of the Baptist Society in that place, he was eagerly followed and admired. It was here that he preached his memorable sermon on 'Modern Infidelity,' which attracted towards him the attention of some of the students and learned members of the University. It was at this early period too, that he produced many others of his most celebrated compositions, among which was the 'Apology for the Freedom of the Press,' first published as a Tract, under the title of 'Christianity consistent with a Love of Freedom'; concerning which Dugald Stewart expressed an opinion, something similar to which is said to have been pronounced by Mr. Pitt of the discourse on Infidelity, which, if true, might, we think, have disarmed Mr. Hall of his virulence against that statesman — 'that it was the finest specimen of English composition then in existence.'

But the malady, with which he had once before been afflicted at the opening of his ministry, again put a stop to

his labors; and, we believe, for nearly seven years he was under the care of Dr. Arnold, an eminent physician in Leicester, and particularly successful in his treatment of the insane. During this period, while his fine genius was suffering a mournful eclipse, he still gave evidence that he was not ignorant of its power; and among his friends some remarkable expressions are remembered, betraying a consciousness of his abilities, singularly contrasted with the humility which is said to mark his usual deportment, and which we are sure he is incapable of violating, when in the full possession of his reason.

On the recovery of his health Mr. Hall consented to take the charge of a society in Leicester, where, as he himself expressed it in our own hearing, 'amidst his native hills, far from that level county of Cambridge, and in scenes endeared to him from his childhood, his soul recovered its freedom.' Here he exercised a faithful, able, and successful ministry for twenty years; making occasional visits to the metropolis, where his preaching was always desired, yet unattended, as we believe, in his usual efforts, with any remarkable excitement. We are led to infer, as must of necessity be true of almost every great public orator, that it is rather on extraordinary occasions, than in the ordinary course of his public labors, that Mr. Hall's distinguished gifts are put forth. He has too much dignity and spirituality of feeling, too much real love of souls, and just appreciation of the design of preaching, to covet the popularity which in London, perhaps, more than in any other place where the sound of the Gospel is heard, has attended some noted mountebanks of his profession. Though not insensible, probably fully alive to the worth of well-earned reputation, we believe, that were it offered him, he would cast beneath his feet, as utterly worthless, the incense which has been poured out in their day upon Collyer and Irvine, and others of like pulpit notoriety, who have appeared upon the stage, not so much we fear for the instruction of souls, as for the gratification of an unprofitable curiosity; and in the result, whatever may have been the sincerity of their own intentions, to let all men see, and the best men lament, that the choicest means of religion may be perverted to the most selfish or secular ends.

At Leicester, as we have understood, Mr. Hall was greatly beloved and respected, not only by the people of his own

charge and denomination, but by the inhabitants of the town in general, and especially by some of the most respectable members of the establishment. The pious and venerable Thomas Robinson, the vicar of St. Mary's in that place, to whose character he paid an affectionate tribute as to a faithful, exemplary, and devoted minister of the established church, was his intimate friend; and when Mr. Hall left Leicester for Bristol to succeed Dr. Ryland in the place where his earliest labors were bestowed, it was with great reluctance on his own part, amidst the deep regrets of his people and expressions of general respect from his brethren and acquaintance of all denominations. In Bristol, as we learn, he is still living; and there, agreeably to the latest accounts of him that have been published, is exerting his admirable gifts and influence in the office which, by his life as well as preaching, he so well magnifies and adorns.

In 1819, the degree of Doctor in Divinity was conferred on him by our University at Cambridge, as it was also, we learn, some years after, by his own college at Aberdeen. His declining to append this title to his name is adduced by his biographer as a 'striking instance of his humility.' It certainly may not be inconsistent with it; and might, with him as with some others, proceed from an unaffected modesty, or from an impression, that distinctions of this class are incompatible with the spirit and with the equality, that should be maintained among the ministers of the lowly Jesus. But in general it may be remarked, that peculiar notions or a fastidious rejection of honors that are usually and by good men coveted, is not in itself a token of humility; that it may, on the contrary, be only one of the diversified forms of vanity or of diseased ambition affecting singularity (which humility never does), and pretending to despise what others count honorable. Most probably in the present case it was judged, and we think very rightly, that the simple name of Robert Hall carried in itself a higher distinction than any academical honors could confer, or that might be distributed among a whole synod of Doctors in Divinity, or of King's Chaplains *in ordinary*.

Of the Polemical writings of Mr. Hall, that on 'Terms of Communion,' the first in the order of these volumes, is the most elaborate; and for the importance of the subject, as

well as for its influence on the members of his own denomination, will probably be regarded as the most valuable. The object of this treatise is to extend the narrow limits of Christian fellowship and charity, within which the Particular Baptists have confined themselves, and to admit to the participation of the Lord's Supper disciples of other names. To establish this, Mr. Hall in the first place takes a view of the arguments commonly urged by the Baptists in favor of strict communion, and more especially considers the plea, that the institution of Christian Baptism *has the priority in point of time* to that of the Lord's Supper. This favorite argument, which had before been assumed as undeniable, he with great ability refutes; and denying also another favorite assumption, the identity of John's baptism with that of our Lord, he shows that *baptism*, whatever it may be understood to imply, at whatever age, or in whatever mode to be administered, *is not an essential prerequisite to the Lord's Supper.*

We cannot be expected to enter into a particular consideration of a subject, which, however interesting it may be to such as choose to multiply unauthorized barriers around the Table of our common Lord, or to confine a fellowship which the Head of the Church has opened to all, has little practical bearing upon Christians of a freer communion. If Mr. Hall did not convince, he at least alarmed his more exclusive brethren; some of whom, in this country as well as in his own (and with the former we believe was the late Rev. Dr. Baldwin), undertook to reply to his arguments. We may here only remark, that the part he sustained in this discussion was altogether worthy of his liberal mind; and we believe, that the weight of his arguments, seconded by that of his character, has availed to diffuse among that respectable denomination more just and scriptural notions of Christian fellowship, and a general spirit of liberality, which have evidently been advancing among them since the date of this controversy; or perhaps we should rather say, for the last quarter of a century. We rejoice sincerely in this progress of Christian light and charity; and to perceive that the miserable exclusiveness, which would shut up Christian ordinances within the narrow limits of a sect, is yielding to a wiser and a nobler spirit.

Mr. Hall, as is well known, has long been a prominent writer in the 'Eclectic Review.' It was in that ably conducted journal, that some of his chief controversial pieces, which were collected not long since and published in this city, under the somewhat dubious title of 'Polemics,' &c., first appeared. We omit the mention of most of them, except to express the satisfaction with which we read the review of the admired 'Essays of John Foster,' in which ample justice is awarded, and that with the hand of a master, to this ingenious and instructive work; and must pass to the notice of another article of a very different character, and, we regret to say, totally unworthy of the author's name. We refer to his review of the 'Memoirs of the late Rev. Theophilus Lindsey,' by Mr. Belsham. In this article, Mr. Hall seems to have given unrestrained indulgence to a spirit, which, though occasionally betrayed in some of his political pieces, is here exhibited in undisguised and revolting features. The most contemptuous expressions are employed, which after all serve him but as an imperfect cover of a rancorous theological hate. The unassuming virtues of Mr. Lindsey, for whom even the warmest of his admirers, as far as we know, never pretended to claim the praise of genius, are insulted; and the sacrifices, to which he submitted in relinquishing his preferments, and the privations he afterwards endured in his conscientious adherence to his convictions, are dismissed with a cold-hearted distrust. The very first sentences in which, contrary to his better knowledge, Mr. Hall confounds Unitarianism with the strange and peculiar tenets of Socinus, and attempts to fasten a stigma upon its believers by reproaching them with a name they never acknowledged, is an example of that illiberal spirit, which, with all our respect for his talents, we must decidedly reprobate. Indeed, when Mr. Hall speaks of Mr. Lindsey or of Mr. Belsham, he seems totally to forget, or else he wantonly violates, the urbanity of the Christian and of the gentleman. He thus introduces this article.

'As the life of Mr. Lindsey is evidently adopted as a vehicle for the propagation of Socinian sentiments, we shall be excused for being more copious in our remarks upon it, than the biography of a man of such extreme mediocrity of talents could otherwise possibly justify. If a zealous attachment to any system of opinions can be supposed to be aided by its

association with personal reputation, we cannot wonder at finding Mr. Lindsey's fondness for Socinianism so ardent and so persevering, inasmuch as the annals of religion scarcely furnish an instance of a celebrity acquired so entirely by the adoption of a particular creed. Luther and Calvin would have risen to distinction, in all probability, if the Reformation had never been heard of; while the existence of such a man as Mr. Lindsey would not have been known beyond the precincts of his parish, had he not, under a peculiar combination of circumstances, embraced the tenets of Socinus.

'His reputation is altogether accidental and factitious. Though the leading events of his life, with one exception, are marked by no striking peculiarity, yet, by the help of a great deal of adventitious matter, Mr. Belsham has contrived to make it the ground work of a bulky, and not unentertaining volume; disfigured, however, throughout, by that languid and inelegant verbosity, which characterizes all his compositions. It must be confessed, Mr. Belsham has taken care in this work to exhibit himself as no ascetic, no religious enthusiast, but quite a man of the world; not by a lively delineation of its manners and foibles, still less by a developement of the principles by which mankind are actuated, but by such a profusion of compliments bestowed on men of rank and title, and so perfect a prostration before secular grandeur, as has never been paralleled, we suspect, in a Christian Divine. At the "pomp and circumstance" of human life, this philosopher appears awed, and planet-struck, and utterly incapable of exercising that small portion of discrimination with which nature has endowed him. Every nobleman or statesman he has occasion to introduce, is uniformly ushered in with a splendid retinue of gorgeous epithets, in which there are as little taste and variety as if they had been copied *verbatim* from the rolls at the Herald's office. Orators of preëminent powers, together with virtuous and enlightened noblemen, meet us at every turn, and we are not a little surprised at finding so much of the decoration and splendor of this mortal scene, in so close contact with the historical details of Unitarianism. We have long remarked the eagerness of Socinians to emblazon their system by associations with learning, rank, and fashion; but on no other occasion have we seen this humor carried so far, as in these Memoirs.' — Vol. I. pp. 411, 412.

The prominent events in the 'Life' are then recapitulated, and in general with tolerable fairness. But whenever Mr. Hall has occasion to refer to the faith Mr. Lindsey had embraced, or to Unitarianism in general, (and for this he

permits no opportunity to pass unimproved) he sets no bounds either to his misrepresentations or his contempt.

For example, having adverted to some statements of Mr. Belsham respecting the favorable progress of Unitarianism, he proceeds to observe;

'It is worthy of remark, that these extravagant boasts of success are not accompanied with the slightest advertence to the moral or spiritual effects, which the Socinian doctrine produces on the character; this is a consideration, which rarely, if ever, enters into the mind of its most zealous abettors, who appear to be perfectly satisfied if they can but accomplish a change of sentiment, however inefficacious to all practical purposes. Their converts are merely proselyted to an opinion, without pretending to be converted to God; and if they are not as much injured by the change as the proselytes made by the Pharisees of old, it must be ascribed to causes totally distinct from the superior excellence of the tenets which they have embraced. They have been taught to discard the worship of Christ, and to abjure all dependence upon him as a Saviour — an admirable preparation, it must be confessed, for a devout and holy life. Let the abettors of those doctrines produce, if they can, a single instance of a person, who, in consequence of embracing them, was reclaimed from a vicious to a virtuous life, from a neglect of serious piety to an exemplary discharge of its obligations and duties; and their success, to whatever extent it has been realized, would suggest an argument in their favor deserving some attention.' — Vol. i. pp. 420, 421.

And again, in concluding his strictures on Mr. Lindsey's publications;

'But it is time to leave Mr. Lindsey to that oblivion which is the infallible destiny of him and of his works, and to proceed to make a few remarks on the narrative, and the miscellaneous strictures of his biographer. In the first place, we congratulate him on his abatement of that tone of arrogance which so strikingly characterized his former publications; not that we ever expect him to exhibit himself in the light of an amiable or unassuming writer, which would be for the Æthiopian to change his skin; but it is with pleasure we remark less insolence and dogmatism than he has displayed on other occasions. He writes like a person who is conscious he is supporting a sinking cause; an air of despondency may be detected amidst his efforts to appear gay and cheerful. He knows perfectly

well that he is celebrating the obsequies, not the triumph, of Socinianism; and from the little advantage it has derived from his former efforts, his vanity will not prevent him from suspecting that he is giving dust to dust, and ashes to ashes.'—Vol. I. pp. 422, 423.

We trust, that with his advancing years and better acquaintance with Unitarians, Mr. Hall has learned to soften somewhat his asperity towards them. And we are truly happy to perceive, from the communication of a recent writer and the affectionate testimony borne to his worth by individuals of that denomination in Bristol,* that he has of late years better exemplified towards them the Christian temper. For —'si sic omnia"—had he always written thus, there is nothing within the scope even of his transcendent abilities; nothing that with such weapons he could have accomplished for the most signal triumphs of a party, that could have rescued him from the dishonor of a virulence and uncharitableness, such as in these days we expect to find only with the meanest and most unworthy of sectarians.

It has not, however, been only to Unitarians, or on topics of religious controversy, that Mr. Hall has descended to reproachful or contemptuous expressions. As a politician and devoted friend of freedom, he enters fully into the feelings, common to minorities in all elective governments, but especially strong among dissenters in England. The disqualifications by which this numerous but suffering body were for so many years oppressed, and from which they are not yet wholly relieved, produced their full influence on his mind, and never failed to impart a good measure of acrimony to his pen. In a letter, which he addressed at a very early period of his career to the Rev. Charles Simeon of Cambridge, the author of the 'Skeletons,' and of somewhat doubtful notoriety among the most zealous of the evangelical party within the establishment, it is easy to see, whatever candor may suggest as to the provocation, that Mr. Hall must have thought he was doing well to be angry; nay, that even in the tenderness of his youth, there was that within him, which could on fit occasion be turned to bitterness and gall. And we remember nothing in the Letters of Junius, which for severity of

* See an American traveller's account of the Rev. Robert Hall, in 'The Unitarian Advocate' for February, 1831.

sarcasm or political hate exceeds the attack on Bishop Horsley, in his preface to the original edition of 'The Apology for the Freedom of the Press.' We must not fail to add, in justice to Mr. Hall, that this passage, delineating the character of the Bishop, was omitted in the second edition; 'it appearing to the writer not quite consistent either with the spirit of Christianity, or with the reverence due to departed genius.' We therefore omit it here, though as a specimen of maligant power, provoked by lordly pride, and writhing under a sense of political injury, we are tempted to preserve it. But, for the severity with which he has treated the political character of Mr. Pitt, he 'is not disposed,' he adds (and this long after that illustrious senator had descended to his grave), 'to apologize.' We may therefore repeat it here. And it is thus, that Mr. Hall speaks of that great statesman and orator of England.

'The character of Pitt is written in sun-beams. A veteran in frauds while in the bloom of youth, betraying first, and then persecuting his earliest friends and connexions, falsifying every promise, and violating every political engagement, ever making the fairest professions a prelude to the darkest actions, punishing with the utmost rigor the publisher of the identical paper he himself had circulated, are traits in the conduct of Pitt, which entitle him to a fatal preëminence in guilt. The qualities of this man balance in an extraordinary manner, and sustain each other. The influence of his station, the extent of his enormities, invest him with a kind of splendor; and the contempt we feel for his meanness and duplicity is lost in the dread of his machinations and the abhorrence of his crimes. Too long has he insulted the patience of his countrymen; nor ought we, when we observe the indifference with which the iniquities of Pitt's administration are viewed, to reproach the Romans for tamely submitting to the tyranny of Caligula or Domitian.' — Vol. II. p. 420.

In some other of the political writings of our author, with which, however, it is not our purpose long to detain the reader, we find more to regret of the same character, in which the meekness of the Christian has very imperfectly controlled the rancor of the politician. And, as is common with zealous partisans, we occasionally detect an inconsistency with himself, which can be explained only by keeping in view the various objects he proposes. The names of

Drs. Price and Priestley, for example, are set in very opposite lights, according to the medium, through which they are to be viewed. When Mr. Hall speaks of them as theologians, or as Unitarians, he is certainly never guilty towards them of any undue respect. But as friends of freedom, enemies of oppression, helpers with himself in the great cause of religious liberty and parliamentary reform, no one can charge him with injustice either to their abilities or to their virtues. Accordingly, in replying to a review in the 'Christian Guardian' of his 'Apology for the Freedom of the Press,' in which a violent attack was made on his own character, after having adverted with fresh severity to Mr. Pitt, he thus proceeds;

'Another head of accusation is, that I have censured the character of Bishop Horsley, whose character, the Reviewer tells us, is far removed beyond my attack, while I have eulogized Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley, Socinians. To this it is sufficient to reply, that Dr. Price was *not* a Socinian, but an Arian: he wrote professedly in confutation of Socinianism; and though I disapprove of his religious principles, I feel no hesitation in affirming, in spite of the frantic and unprincipled abuse of Burke, that a more ardent and enlightened friend of his country never lived, than that venerable patriarch of freedom. Such were the sentiments of the worshipful Corporation of London, who in token of their esteem presented him with the freedom of the City in a golden box: such was the judgment of Mr. Pitt, who long professed himself his admirer, and condescended to seek his advice on questions of finance. Dr. Priestley, it is acknowledged, was a Socinian; but it was not under that character that he was eulogized. It was as the friend of liberty, the victim of intolerance, and the author of some of the most brilliant philosophical discoveries of modern times, for which he was celebrated throughout Europe, and his name enrolled as a member of the most illustrious institutions; so that my eulogy was but a mere feeble echo of the applause which resounded from every civilized portion of the globe.' — Vol. II. p. 485.

Again in the essay, entitled 'Christianity consistent with the Love of Freedom,' of which the author himself, as we have said, — probably on account of its offensive personalities, forbid a republication, he thus generously repels the accusations of a high-churchman against Dr. Priestley;

'The reader can be at no loss to determine, whom the author intends by *a busy, active man in regenerating the civil constitutions of nations.* The occasion of the sermon, and complexion of its sentiments, concur in directing us to Dr. Priestley; a person whom the author seems to regard with a more than *odium theologicum*, with a rancor exceeding even the measure of his profession. The religious tenets of Dr. Priestley appear to me erroneous in the extreme, but I should be sorry to suffer any difference of sentiment to diminish my sensibility to virtue, or my admiration of genius. From him the poisoned arrow will fall pointless. His enlightened and active mind, his unwearied assiduity, the extent of his researches, the light he has poured into almost every department of science, will be the admiration of that period, when the greater part of those who have favored, or those who have opposed him, will be alike forgotten. Distinguished merit will ever rise superior to oppression, and will draw lustre from reproach. The vapors which gather round the rising sun, and follow it in its course, seldom fail at the close of it to form a magnificent theatre for its reception, and to invest with variegated tints, and with a softened effulgence the luminary which they cannot hide.' — Vol. II. p. 399.

We are by no means surprised at the weight of political influence which a writer, like Mr. Hall, is said to exert. With his truly Roman love of freedom and indignant hatred of oppression; with his command too of the resources of language, and no reluctance withal to draw from his ample treasury, as occasion may invite, the terrors of his rebukes or of his biting sarcasm, — any administration under a free government, like that of England, would be eager to secure his powerful aid, and might reasonably fear his hostile pen. But when we consider the comparative obscurity of his situation and his devotion to his own calling, we think there must be some exaggeration in the estimate of the compiler of these Memoirs, when he says, 'There is not, perhaps, a man now living of whom the English politicians stand so much in awe as of Robert Hall.'

But we quit with pleasure his works as a controversialist, whether of church or state, which we are willing to consider his 'strange work,' in most of which his abilities are displayed to much greater advantage than his temper, — that we may consider Mr. Hall in his appropriate and far more elevated character as a Christian minister and teacher. It

is on this peaceful, consecrated ground, that we rejoice to meet him. This is his chosen field, in which, to (borrow from the same spiritual treasury, whence he is accustomed himself to derive his choicest ornaments) he appears always a 'scribe well instructed,' a 'workman, indeed, that needeth not to be ashamed,' a 'wise master-builder,' who leaves us scarce any thing to blame, and almost every thing to admire in his noble genius, his unrivalled eloquence, his evangelic fervor, his sanctified and glowing zeal.

Did our limits permit a full account of Mr. Hall's pulpit compositions, we should, at once, invite our readers to examine with us some parts of his discourse on 'Modern Infidelity.' This, perhaps, on the whole, the most celebrated, was also among the earliest of his compositions; 'the beginnings of his strength,' as it assuredly shows 'the excellence of his power.' It was produced at a crisis of great interest to the peace and religion of Europe, when the influence of the French Revolution had come to be extensively felt, and men, in a blind pursuit of civil liberty, seemed willing to disengage themselves from all religious restraints. Mr. Hall met the emergency as became a preacher of righteousness; and with that weapon, which since the days of miraculous illumination, no man has wielded more skilfully, — even the sword of the spirit and the word of God, — he assailed 'Modern Infidelity,' in its strongest and most secret holds. His success placed him, at once, among the ablest advocates of religion, and the benefactors of his country. 'It procured him,' says his biographer, 'the esteem of many illustrious characters both in church and state.'

The sermon itself, as is stated by the writer in his preface, was not committed to paper till after it was delivered. It was, no doubt, elaborately meditated, and afterwards very carefully written; so that what the reader might lose in the impressive elocution of the preacher, or his bursts of extemporaneous eloquence, imparting 'a grace beyond the rules of art,' is probably fully made up in the accuracy and condensation of the reasoning. As the discourse is so well known, or may now be so easily obtained, we shall not occupy our pages with more than a single extract, in which the author speaks of the '*principle of vanity*,' as most conspicuously displayed amidst the successive struggles for power during the French Revolution, and as, in itself, a fruitful source, as well as a natural effect of infidelity.

We recommend the whole sermon to the careful study of old men or of young ones, at the present day, who from their *vanity*, impatience of salutary restraints, hope of building up themselves on ruins, or any other passion, are tempted to a form of unbelief yet more modern, but in no wise less corrupting, than that which in some of its insidious influences is here so faithfully exposed.

'We shall suffer the most eventful season ever witnessed in the affairs of men to pass over our heads to very little purpose, if we fail to learn from it some awful lessons on the nature and progress of the passions. The true light in which the French revolution ought to be contemplated is that of a grand experiment on human nature. Among the various, passions which that revolution has so strikingly displayed, none is more conspicuous than vanity; nor is it less difficult, without adverting to the national character of the people, to account for its extraordinary predominance. Political power, the most seducing object of ambition, never before circulated through so many hands; the prospect of possessing it was never before presented to so many minds. Multitudes, who, by their birth and education, and not unfrequently by their talents, seemed destined to perpetual obscurity, were by the alternate rise and fall of parties, elevated into distinction, and shared in the functions of government. The short-lived forms of power and office glided with such rapidity through successive ranks of degradation, from the court to the very dregs of the populace, that they seemed rather to solicit acceptance than to be a prize contended for. Yet, as it was impossible for all to possess authority, though none were willing to obey, a general impatience to break the ranks and rush into the foremost ground, maddened and infuriated the nation, and overwhelmed law, order, and civilization, with the violence of a torrent.'

'Humility is the first fruit of religion. In the mouth of our Lord there is no maxim so frequent as the following: *Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.* Religion, and that alone, teaches *absolute* humility; by which I mean a sense of our *absolute* nothingness in the view of infinite greatness and excellence. That sense of inferiority, which results from the comparison of men with each other, is often an unwelcome sentiment forced upon the mind, which may rather embitter the temper than soften it; that which devotion impresses is soothing and delightful. The devout man loves to lie low at the footstool of his Creator, because it is then he attains the most lively perceptions of the

divine excellence, and the most tranquil confidence in the divine favor. In so august a presence he sees all distinctions lost, and all beings reduced to the same level. He looks at his superiors without envy, and his inferiors without contempt; and when from his elevation he descends to mix in society, the conviction of superiority, which must in many instances be felt, is a calm inference of the understanding, and no longer a busy, importunate passion of the heart.

'*The wicked* (says the Psalmist) *through the pride of their countenance, will not seek after God; God is not in all their thoughts.* When we consider the incredible vanity of the atheistical sect, together with the settled malignity and unrelenting rancor with which they pursue every vestige of religion, is it uncandid to suppose that its humbling tendency is one principal cause of their enmity; that they are eager to displace a Deity from the minds of men, that they may occupy the void; to crumble the throne of the Eternal into dust, that they may elevate themselves on its ruins; and that as their licentiousness is impatient of restraint, so their pride disdains a superior?' — Vol. II. pp. 28—30.

In the year 1803, when England had just entered upon its longest and most desolating war with France, and there were reasonable fears of an invasion of some part of the kingdom by the French ruler, Mr. Hall delivered a discourse at Bristol, in the chapel of his friend, the late excellent Mr. Lowell, on the day appointed for a general fast, and before a company of volunteers. This is the sermon, to which we have referred under the title of 'Sentiments proper to the Present Crisis.' Our readers may readily conceive the effect with which the following sentences in the conclusion, addressed to an assembly of soldiers, might be attended. It furnishes, also, an example of the manner in which the preacher is accustomed to avail himself of the prophetic language of the Scriptures. We know not how it may seem to others, but to us all the splendors of the embattled field, with the 'confused noise of the warrior,' and all the inspirations of martial pomp or melody, would have little power to awaken heroic courage in the soul, compared with sentiments like these.

'To form an adequate idea of the duties of this crisis, it will be necessary to raise your minds to a level with our station, to extend your views to a distant futurity, and to consequences the most certain, though most remote. By a series of criminal

enterprises, by the success of guilty ambition, the liberties of Europe have been gradually extinguished; the subjugation of Holland, Switzerland, and the free towns of Germany, has completed that catastrophe; and we are the only people in the eastern hemisphere, who are in possession of equal laws and a free constitution. Freedom, driven from every spot on the continent, has sought an asylum in a country which she always chose for her favorite abode; but she is pursued even here, and threatened with destruction. The inundation of lawless power, after covering the whole earth, threatens to follow us here; and we are most exactly, most critically placed in the only aperture where it can be successfully repelled; in the Thermopylæ of the universe. As far as the interests of freedom are concerned, the most important by far of sublunary interests, you my countrymen, stand in the capacity of the federal representatives of the human race; for in you it is to determine (under God) in what condition the latest posterity shall be born; their fortunes are entrusted to your hand, and on your conduct, at this moment, depends the color and complexion of their destiny. If liberty, after being extinguished on the continent, is suffered to expire here, whence is it ever to emerge in the midst of that thick night that will invest it? It remains, with you, then, to decide, whether that freedom, at whose voice the kingdoms of Europe awoke from the sleep of ages, to run a career of virtuous emulation in every thing great and good; the freedom which dispelled the mists of superstition, and invited the nations to behold their God; whose magic touch kindled the rays of genius, the enthusiasm of poetry, and the flame of eloquence; the freedom which poured into our lap opulence and arts, and embellished life with innumerable institutions and improvements, till it became a theatre of wonders; it is for you to decide whether this freedom shall yet survive, or be covered with a funeral pall, and wrapt in eternal gloom. It is not necessary to await your determination. In the solicitude you feel to approve yourselves worthy of such a trust, every thought of what is afflicting in warfare, every apprehension of danger must vanish, and you are impatient to mingle in the battle of the civilized world. Go, then, ye defenders of your country, accompanied with every auspicious omen; advance with alacrity into the field, where God himself musters the hosts to war. Religion is too much interested in your success not to lend you her aid. She will shed over this enterprise her selectest influence. While you are engaged in the field, many will repair to the closet, many to the sanctuary; the faithful of every name will employ that prayer which has power with God; the feeble

hands which are unequal to any other weapon, will grasp the sword of the spirit; and from myriads of humble and contrite hearts, the voice of intercession, supplication, and weeping, will mingle in its ascent to heaven with the shouts of battle and the shock of arms.'

'I cannot but imagine the virtuous heroes, legislators, and patriots of every age and country, are bending from elevated seats to witness this contest, as if they were incapable, till it be brought to a favorable issue, of enjoying their eternal repose. Enjoy that repose, illustrious immortals! your mantle fell when you ascended; and thousands, inflamed with your spirit, and impatient to tread in your steps, are ready to *swear by Him that sitteth upon the throne, and liveth for ever and ever*, they will protect freedom in her last asylum, and never desert that cause which you sustained by your labors, and cemented with your blood. And thou, sole Ruler among the children of men, to whom the shields of the earth belong, *gird on thy sword, thou Most Mighty;* go forth with our hosts in the day of battle. Impart, in addition to their hereditary valor, that confidence of success which springs from thy presence; pour into their hearts the spirit of departed heroes; inspire them with thine own; and, while led by thine hand, and fighting under thy banners, open thou their eyes to behold in every valley, and in every plain, what the prophet beheld by the same illumination, chariots of fire and horses of fire. *Then shall the strong man be as tow, and the maker of it as a spark, and they shall both burn together, and none shall quench them.*'—Vol. II. pp. 107—109.

But there is no one of these discourses, in which the peculiar power, the holy eloquence, of this remarkable preacher is more happily put forth than in his funeral sermon on 'the Death of the Princess Charlotte.' That event, so sudden, so affecting,—blasting in an hour, by a double infliction, the prospects, not of a family only, but of an empire, was indeed a fit occasion, if ever, to impress solemn instruction. It was truly 'a night to be remembered,' when death went up into the royal chambers, and regardless alike of conjugal or maternal love, and of a nation's prayers, extinguished at once all that could be combined in princely grandeur and beauty and power, the fulness of possession or the visions of hope; 'leaving in their room the funeral pall and shroud, a palace in mourning, a people in tears, and the shadow of death settled over both like a cloud.' Well may we here exclaim with the preacher, 'O the unspeakable vanity of

human hopes! The incurable blindness of man to futurity! Ever doomed to grasp at shadows, to seize with avidity what turns to dust and ashes in his hand, to "sow to the wind and to reap the whirlwind."'

Mr. Hall regarded this event, as he was wont to regard the whole providence of God. Many other preachers improved the occasion; and indeed the churches of all denominations from one end of the kingdom to the other, on the day appointed for the funeral, were crowded we are informed,* with listening and weeping hearers. But of the discourses, which were published, of which we have seen noticed more than twenty, by some of the most distinguished clergymen of the day, among whom was the learned Dr. Bloomfield, the present Bishop of London; there was none, which was admired or remembered, as was this of Mr. Hall. And when we consider, as he himself modestly intimates, the comparative obscurity of his lot, as the minister of a dissenting chapel in a remote part of the kingdom, belonging to a denomination of Christians, who, however respectable for their numbers, piety, or zeal, have not till recently even coveted the distinctions of learning; separated, too, by his early education and habits from all the associations of rank and grandeur; we are only the more astonished at the truth and justness, as well as sublimity of his conceptions. From his pulpit of instruction he looks on the glory of princes *as it is;* unaffected by the glare of earthly greatness, except as he sees it in its uncertainty; fixing his own regards upon what is eternal; feeling that amidst all the splendor and power of earthly monarchs, 'God alone is great'; † while, as a subject and a fellow-mortal, he yields them their due place among the things that are temporal.

With what true philosophy, on the one side, with what instructive and subduing eloquence on the other, does he contemplate at once the distinctions of royalty and the utter obliteration of such distinctions, the equality of the mightiest and the meanest, when God brings them together to the grave! It is thus Mr. Hall describes the extent of this calam-

* See an interesting volume of 'Memoirs of the Princess Charlotte, by a Barrister,' which is among the best of the many publications called forth by that event.

† Massillon's Sermon at the Funeral of Louis the Fourteenth.

ity, and the difference of the emotions excited by a domestic and a national grief.

'The first particular which strikes the attention in this solemn visitation, is the rank of the illustrious personage, who appears to have been placed on the pinnacle of society for the express purpose of rendering her fall the more conspicuous, and of convincing as many as are susceptible of conviction, that "man at his best estate is altogether vanity." The Deity himself adorned the victim with his own hands, accumulating upon her all the decorations and ornaments best adapted to render her the object of universal admiration. He permitted her to touch whatever this sublunary scene presents that is most attractive and alluring, but to grasp nothing; and after conducting her to an eminence whence she could survey all the glories of empire as her destined possession, closed her eyes in death.

'That such an event should affect us in a manner very superior to similar calamities, which occur in private life, is agreeable to the order of nature, and the will of God; nor is the profound sensation it has produced to be considered as the symbol of courtly adulation. The catastrophe itself, it is true, apart from its peculiar circumstances, is not a rare occurrence. Mothers often expire in the ineffectual effort to give birth to their offspring; both are consigned to the same tomb, and the survivor, after witnessing the wreck of so many hopes and joys, is left to mourn alone, "refusing to be comforted, because they are not." There is no sorrow which imagination can picture, no sign of anguish, which nature agonized and oppressed can exhibit, no accent of woe, but what is already familiar to the ear of fallen, afflicted humanity; and the roll which Ezekiel beheld, flying through the heavens, inscribed within and without, "with sorrow, lamentation, and woe," enters, sooner or later, into every house, and discharges its contents in every bosom. But in the private departments of life, the distressing incidents which occur, are confined to a narrow circle. The hope of an individual is crushed; the happiness of a family is destroyed; but the social system is unimpaired, and its movements experience no impediment, and sustain no sensible injury. The arrow passes through the air, which soon closes upon it, and all is tranquil. But when the great lights and ornaments of the world, placed aloft to conduct its inferior movements, are extinguished, such an event resembles the apocalyptic vial poured into that element, which changes its whole temperature, and is the presage of fearful commotions, of thunders, lightnings, and tempests.' — Vol. II. pp. 165, 166.

Having then adverted with equal beauty and truth to the disposition common among men, to associate with exalted birth the idea of superior felicity, and to contemplate it with a pleasure unalloyed *(because of the very impossibility of attaining it)* by the envy which naturally springs up among equals, or where competition is not hopeless; having observed in the same connexion, that we are formed to be peculiarly affected by the spectacle of prostrate majesty and fallen greatness, he thus returns to the illustrious theme of these instructions;

'Is it now any subject of regret, think you, to this amiable Princess so suddenly removed, "that her sun went down while it was yet day," or that, prematurely snatched from prospects the most brilliant and enchanting, she was compelled to close her eyes so soon on a world, of whose grandeur she formed so conspicuous a part? No. Other objects occupy her mind, other thoughts engage her attention, and will continue to engage it for ever. All things with her are changed; and viewed from that pure and ineffable light, for which, we humbly hope, religion prepared her, the lustre of a diadem is scarcely visible, majesty emits a feeble and sickly ray, and all ranks and conditions of men appear but so many troops of pilgrims in different garbs, toiling through the same vale of tears, distinguished only by different degrees of wretchedness.'

'While we look at this event with the eyes of flesh, and survey it in the aspect it bears towards our national prospects, it appears a most singular and affecting catastrophe. But considered in itself, or more properly in its relation to a certain, though invisible futurity, its consequences are but commensurate to those which result from the removal of the meanest individual. He, whose death is as little regarded as the fall of a leaf in the forest, and he whose departure involves a nation in despair, are in this view of the subject (by far the most important one) upon a level. Before the presence of the great I AM, into which they both immediately enter, these distinctions vanish, and the true statement of the fact, on either supposition, is, that an immortal spirit has finished its earthly career; has passed the barriers of the invisible world, to appear before its Maker, in order to receive that sentence which will fix its irrevocable doom, "according to the deeds done in the body." On either supposition an event has taken place, which has no parallel in the revolutions of time, the consequences of which have not room to expand themselves within a narrower sphere, than an endless duration. An event has occurred, the issues of

which must ever baffle and elude all finite comprehension, by concealing themselves in the depths of that abyss, of that eternity, which is the dwelling-place of Deity, where there is sufficient space for the destiny of each among the innumerable millions of the human race to develope itself, and, without interference or confusion, to sustain and carry forward its separate infinity of interest.' — Vol. II. pp. 173, 174.

Notwithstanding the elevated rank of this young princess, and the obvious disproportion between her condition, as the heiress of the most desirable kingdom of the world, and that of any individual among us, yet we are persuaded that the sentiments of this discourse will at once find their way to every reflecting mind. They may instruct and comfort those, even in the humblest walks of life, from whom it may please God, at any time, to 'take away the desire of their eyes,' or to remove of the cherished objects of their love. For it is the province, as it is also the glory of religion, to adapt its truths and its consolations to human beings of every variety of condition. And while the world addresses itself, in one way, to the great and prosperous, and in another to the humble or sorrowful, the Gospel of Christ, overlooking all temporal distinctions, offers itself to them alike, as the power of God to salvation, as the common solace of their griefs, and their common refuge of hope, through the grave, that awaits them all. There is perpetual need of such instruction. Within the circle of every human society scarcely a month can pass without some interesting, though certainly not so signal, evidence of the universal frailty. And there is no one, even in the most sequestered scenes, who under the disappointment of his domestic hopes, the rupture of the conjugal or the parental tie, may not be soothed and admonished by the reflexions, which were so solemnly uttered over the grave of the Princess Charlotte.

Had it pleased Providence, that she should live, she would already have ascended the throne of her fathers, and would at this moment be the queen of Great Britain. Whether her education and character, to say nothing of her German alliance, would have fitted her for the present times; whether, in the present eventful state of Europe, when nations are calling upon kings for their rights, and the firmest and the most ancient thrones are tottering, she would have had wisdom and moderation to meet the emergency; or whether the

natural impetuosity of her spirit, which, it is said, she early betrayed, conspiring with hereditary notions of kingly power, and doubtless encouraged by a ministry of her own creation, might not, in the result, have proved injurious to the welfare, and even the safety of England, are speculations into which we pretend not to enter. The uncertainty attending them may, at least, suggest reasons for adoring a perfect Providence, even in what, at the time, appear its most mysterious dispensations; and, as with regard to other events that affect only our most private relations, for rejoicing that the 'only wise God,' the King eternal, omnipotent, reigneth, and that if man will but wait the issue, 'what he knows not now, he shall know hereafter.'

We have dwelt on this discourse much longer than we intended; for both the occasion and the manner of improving it furnish fruitful subjects for reflexion. There are other works of Mr. Hall of a different class, particularly those in which he has exercised his powerful mind on the subjects of 'Foreign Missions,' 'Bible Societies,' the 'State of Slavery,' and the 'Prospects of Christianity,' which, as they open of themselves a very extensive field, may well deserve, as they are exhibited in these volumes, a distinct consideration. This, however, we reserve for a future number.

ART. VI. —1. *A Letter to William E. Channing, D. D. on the subject of Religious Liberty.* By MOSES STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Third Edition. Boston. Perkins & Marvin. 1830. 8vo. pp. 52.

2. *Two Letters to the Rev. Moses Stuart, on the subject of Religious Liberty.* By BERNARD WHITMAN. Boston. Gray & Bowen. 1830. 8vo. pp. 166.

WHEN we were told, on the first appearance of Professor Stuart's Letter to Dr. Channing, that his object was to represent the Orthodox in this country as the calm, meek, and unoffending victims of Unitarian intolerance and persecution, we could hardly believe that he was in earnest. We had been reading, a little while before, several paragraphs in the

leading orthodox publications, in which Unitarianism was treated as being, to borrow the dignified language of the writers, 'on its last legs.' We supposed, too, in the simplicity of our hearts, that there was a pretty general impression in the community, that the measures taken to suppress or check the reputed heresy, were, to say the least, sufficiently strong. There seemed to be something unaccountable and bewildering, therefore, something almost ludicrous, in the new turn which we were given to understand that the controversy was taking, and in the new charges which we were to prepare ourselves to meet.

Perhaps we are not sufficiently suspicious of human nature, or enough on our guard against the manœuvring of able and wary antagonists. However this may be, we must say, that a careful and dispassionate perusal of Professor Stuart's pamphlet has convinced us, that he is perfectly sincere and honest in the *belief*, that he and his friends have been wronged. His language is that of one who writes under a keen sense of real or imagined injury, heightened and exasperated, it is true, by disappointment and mortification at the obvious tendency of things in this Commonwealth. Any man, and especially any man of Professor Stuart's reputation and place in society, who comes before the public in this state of mind, should be heard, as we think, not only with candor, but with tenderness and generosity. His letter has not thrown much light, it must be confessed, on the great subject of religious freedom, either in the way of argument or illustration, and amounts to little more than a positive and earnest declaration, that on this subject in particular the Orthodox party have been most unjustly and cruelly calumniated, and especially by Dr. Channing. 'I DO KNOW,' says he, addressing Dr. Channing, 'that the accusations which you stand pledged to support ARE NOT TRUE. I AVER that they are not, before heaven and earth.'

We will presume, that when Professor Stuart says, 'I do know,' he merely means, 'I do believe'; for otherwise we should be under the disagreeable necessity of convicting him of something worse than speaking unadvisedly and rashly. He misconceives, at least he misrepresents, in some important respects, the purpose and tendency of Dr. Channing's controversial writings; he denies, that there is any ground for many of the charges, which he supposes them to contain

against the Orthodox; and concludes with demanding, that the facts, which these charges imply, should be produced and made good, or that the charges themselves should be taken back. The facts here demanded, or rather a selection from them, are now before him in Mr. Whitman's Letters; collected all must allow, with great industry and care, and expressed and authenticated with extraordinary calmness, method, and perspicuity. We hope, therefore, that Professor Stuart, and his friends, will have the ingenuousness to acknowledge, that his call, in this instance at least, has been fairly met; with what success it will be neither for them, nor for us, but for the public to decide.

This controversy is not one of our own seeking, and if we were to consult our tastes and personal feelings only, we should enter upon it with extreme reluctance. We hope, however, to obviate in a great measure the general objections to which such discussions are liable, by confining ourselves, as far as is practicable, to public acts, or at least to acts of public men, which are known and can be proved by public documents. Mr. Whitman's Letters to Professor Stuart contain, besides these, many well authenticated facts of a more private nature, which will cause his pamphlet to be eagerly and extensively read; but they do not bear so directly on the argument, and we shall, therefore, leave them out of view, for the most part, in the notice which we propose to give of the great question at issue. We regret that Professor Stuart did not see fit to give his thoughts more order and method, as in that case we could have examined his Letter paragraph by paragraph. As it is, however, we do not mean, that any important complaint, allegation, or menace shall pass without comment.

To begin, then, with the beginning. Professor Stuart sits down to write, as it seems to us, with singularly vague and ill defined conceptions of what constitutes religious liberty. In his Election Sermon he says;

'I am well aware, that there is much ground here, which has been, and which may be, disputed. It has been often alleged, by those who defend an exclusive civil establishment in matters of religion, that it is inconsistent with the prosperity, and even with the safety of any State, that any other form of worship than the one established should be tolerated. They avow moreover the belief, that there is a right in the civil government to prescribe in regard to the subject of religion, similar

in its nature to the right which authorizes the same power to restrain theft, robbery, slander, or any other offences of a moral nature.

'It must be acknowledged, that it is not easy to meet the simple theoretical principle of this argument, by reasoning which is conclusive. "If the civil power has a right to interfere at all with the moral conduct of citizens, and to regulate it so as to promote what it judges to be the greatest public good; then why may it not interfere with matters of religion, which most of all are concerned with the regulation of the public morals?"' — pp. 11, 12.

Further on he says;

'On similar grounds, men, who avow principles which render null all obligation by an oath, either an oath of office, or one for the purpose of legal testimony, ought to be subjected to the disability which this creates. All who deny the doctrine of future retribution for crimes committed in the present world, do plainly, in the eye of reason, incur a disability of such a nature. Persons of this class fall below the very heathen, in their religious sentiments; for most of the Pagans have always admitted, in some form or other, the doctrine of punishment in the world to come for crimes committed in the present life. There can be no possible sanction to the oath of a man, who rejects all future punishment; and it is palpably a mere mockery of all the forms of justice, and of all the rational principles of true liberty, to admit those to the privileges of an oath, who deny that God will judge the earth, and reward men hereafter according to their works.' — pp. 15, 16.

Again he says, in his Letter to Dr. Channing;

'We know of *no exception* to participation in *civil* and *social* rights, and *the right of worshipping in our own way*, or of even *not worshipping in any way*, under a government that is free in the sense that we would have it; and all this without any abridgment of the rights of citizens, without any civil disabilities.' — p. 14.

He immediately adduces as exceptions to this rule, which he has just said admits of 'no exception,' the case of Universalists, as set forth in his Election Sermon, and that also of Atheists. Then follow the grounds on which, according to Professor Stuart, religious liberty is to be defended and maintained.

'We are aware how much has been said, and may be said, in favor of the State having some established form of religion,

and some particular religious test of office. But we are fully persuaded, that the evils which result from such an arrangement very much outweigh all the good that can be derived from it. Religion, all true religion, is a *voluntary* offering on the part of man to his Creator. A forced creed is no creed. Belief, from its own nature and the very constitution of the human mind, must be free, spontaneous, induced by argument, not compelled by fear or by threats. All professed belief of this latter kind, is utterly unworthy of the name. It is an object of abhorrence to God, and of loathing to men. And whether an attempt is made to force it on our minds, by the terrors of an Inquisitorial tribunal, or by the milder penalties of additional taxation and loss of civil rights, it matters not with us. We will not say that both of these ways of enforcing it ought to receive equal disapprobation from us; but we do truly say, that both receive our unqualified disapprobation.

'We are the more confirmed in our views of religious liberty as already explained, because we see very plainly, that the religious opinions which the civil power may sanction to-day, it may to-morrow proscribe. It has often done so. But believing as we do, that religion is a matter of immeasurably greater interest than every thing which pertains to the present world, we should be among the last men on earth to commit the disposal of our faith to the civil magistrate, who might one day exalt the Christian religion, and on another trample the cross beneath his feet. We set too high a value on this precious gift of heaven, ever voluntarily to commit the keeping of it to hands which may thus desecrate and abuse it.

'I have only a word to add here, in order to prevent being misunderstood, respecting a *special* obligation which one may *voluntarily* contract, to a religious society who cherish a particular belief.

'If we enter such a society, professing the same belief with them, and understand it as a condition of membership or good standing among them that we continue to cherish the same belief, then, in case we do change it, it is plainly lawful and proper that the society should withdraw from its connexion with us as a member. But all this is a thing merely of *voluntary* obligation. And in *no case whatever*, do we believe that civil disabilities or penalities should be connected with any excommunication by a Christian church.' — pp. 14, 15.

Here certainly is a strange jumble of 'exceptions' and 'no exceptions.' The reader will observe, that Professor Stuart's notions of religious liberty do not prevent him from holding that a portion of the community at least, should be

laid under civil disabilities, 'on the ground of religious opinion.' We are also startled at the concession, considered as coming from a Protestant and a Congregationalist, that the theoretical argument, which gives to the civil government 'a right' to restrain heresy, on the same principles on which it does robbery and theft, can scarcely be met 'by reasoning which is conclusive.' But we have been chiefly struck with the total insufficiency of the grounds of religious liberty, as stated by Professor Stuart, if he means to advocate it as an inalienable right. Coercion, he says, cannot effect its purposes in compelling belief, because 'a forced creed is no creed'; and therefore legislative interference must be *futile*. And again; the civil power may be in the hands of misbelievers, or if it is in the hands of the Orthodox to-day, it may be in the hands of misbelievers to-morrow; and, therefore, legislative interference, as a general and established rule, would be *unsafe*. For these reasons, and as it would seem, for these reasons only, Professor Stuart comes to the conclusion, that legislative interference in matters of faith and conscience would be futile and unsafe in the present state of society. He does not say, nor intimate, nor imply, if we understand him aright, that it would be *wrong in itself*.

To what, then, do his arguments and protestations as a friend and advocate of religious liberty amount? Simply to this. Without admitting the innocence of involuntary error, without making the proper and necessary distinction between opinion and action as an object of government and legislation, without disproving or attempting to disprove the abstract right of government to punish reputed heresies, he comes, forsooth, to the conclusion, that the actual exertion of this right would be futile and unsafe in the present state of society, except perhaps in regard to Universalists and Atheists. Futile and unsafe? Let Professor Stuart go with this argument to his Most Catholic Majesty the king of Spain, and say, 'A forced creed is no creed.' He would be told, and told truly, that though force cannot be made to act directly on opinion, it may be made to act indirectly; that men may be placed in circumstances, and by force too, which will essentially influence and restrain freedom of thought. Let him, then, advise Ferdinand to renounce the policy as unsafe, because the civil power, though in the hands of Catholics to-day, may pass into the hands of Protestants to-morrow.

The monarch would tell him, we suspect, that he, his confessors, and the Inquisition would see to that. The true and the only ground on which entire religious liberty can be defended and maintained is this, that mere opinion, sincere and honest opinion, is in no case whatsoever criminal, and in no case whatsoever, and for no reasons whatsoever, the object of government or law. This ground Professor Stuart has not taken, and we presume will not take; and therefore it is, that what he calls religious liberty, and thinks to defend from considerations of expediency and practicability, rather than as a sacred, inborn, and inalienable right, is not religious liberty, but at most, and at best, religious toleration.

Professor Stuart speaks of 'a *special* obligation, which one may *voluntarily* contract,' on entering a religious society in which a profession of the same belief is understood to be a condition of membership. Now the question is not, in this discussion, whether the obligation is contracted voluntarily, or involuntarily; or whether a man has a right to contract such an obligation; or whether in any circumstances it would be expedient to do so. The question is, whether having contracted such an obligation, and while under it, a man can still be said to be in the full enjoyment of entire religious liberty. Can a man, while a member of such a society, and as a member of such a society, hold and profess whatever opinions he is honestly convinced are true? Professor Stuart assumes, if we understand him aright, or if what he says in the passage referred to, is pertinent, or consistent with his general doctrine, that when a man gives up his liberty, or any part of it, *voluntarily*, he does not give it up at all. In other words, if a man sells himself into slavery voluntarily, there is something in the consideration that he has done it voluntarily, which prevents his slavery from being slavery. Here, we must repeat it, the question is not whether a man has a right to make himself a slave, or whether in any circumstances it can be expedient for him to do so; but whether being a slave, voluntarily or involuntarily, he is at the same time free.

Perhaps a member of such a society is accounted free, because he is free at any moment to leave the society, and having left it, he can hold and profess whatever opinions he pleases. That is to say, if a slave is free, at any moment, to assert his liberty and quit his present condition, he ceases to

be a slave, even though in point of fact he does not assert his liberty, and prefers to continue, and actually does continue, in bondage. The question here is not, whether the members of such a society are free to make themselves free, or whether they might not become free in other connexions, and under other obligations; but whether they are free now, in their present connexions and under their present obligations. Would you not, then, we may be asked, allow a man, if he sees fit, to relinquish any portion of his liberty, especially if it is 'a thing of merely *voluntary* obligation,' and may be retracted at pleasure? Is it not essential to perfect liberty, that a man should be at liberty to do what he will with his liberty? Granting all this, it has nothing to do with the present argument. Whenever Professor Stuart, or his friends, shall agitate the question, whether they have a right to suspend, relinquish, or renounce their own religious liberty, it will be time enough to inquire into the grounds of such a right. The question now at issue between us is, whether they can give up their religious liberty, or any part of it, in any way whatever, and still retain it. Can they have it, and not have it, at the same moment?

Absurd and self-contradictory as this may be made to appear in theory, some may still contend that, in practice, the influence of Professor Stuart's '*special* obligation,' considered as a restraint on liberty, amounts to nothing. A few people who happen to think alike on religious matters, agree to worship together so long as they continue to think alike, and no longer. Whenever any one of them sees fit to alter his mind, he does it, and incurs no penalty for so doing, but that to which he has voluntarily subjected himself — expulsion from the society. Civil disabilities or penalties are never resorted to in these cases, and are disclaimed and condemned alike by all parties. This, we are given to understand, is the practical operation of Professor Stuart's principle; the practical operation of Orthodox tests, and creeds, and church covenants in this community, as enforced by Exclusionists.

The facts, however, are so far from warranting such a representation, that we can hardly look on a man as serious who makes it, or who assumes it, or any thing like it, in his reasonings. When a man assents to the covenant on entering an Orthodox church, he is understood to do it for life; and if he afterwards sees fit to alter his mind, he is told that

he has broken his covenant vows. Excommunication does not take place on the ground that a man has altered his mind merely, but on the ground that he has ceased to be a Christian. Every means is put in requisition, therefore, that can be in a free country, to keep or reclaim him from an apostasy, which is regarded and treated as criminal. He is flattered and cajoled, or warned and intimidated, or wept over and prayed over, as the case may be. Should this fail to prevent him from being convinced, and avowing his conviction, that the Bible inculcates a different doctrine from the human creed, he is cut off as an unworthy member. He is thrust out from ordinances, to which, it would seem, that he has as good a title as any other conscientious believer. His moral and religious character suffers essentially in the estimation of those, perhaps, whom he most esteems. He meets with cold and averted looks, where he used to be received with open arms, and, it may be, among his own kindred, and in his own house. All this a man does suffer, and must suffer, for thinking, speaking, and acting independently, under the practical operation of the exclusive system; and will it be pretended, that all this is nothing?

Several documents and testimonies collected by Mr. Whitman will serve to illustrate and confirm these statements, though facts of the kind here given are so common and notorious, as to make it perhaps unnecessary.

'Let me quote a few sentences, in proof of this assertion, from the covenant of one of your new churches. "Hereafter you can *never withdraw* from the watch and communion of *saints* without a *breach of covenant*. Let it be impressed on your minds, that you have come under *solemn obligations*, from which you can *never escape*. Wherever you go, these *vows* will be upon you. They will follow you to the bar of God; and in whatever world you may be fixed, *will abide upon you to eternity*. You have *unalterably committed* yourselves, and henceforth you *must* be the servants of God."'—p. 47.

'In one instance, the minister assured a lady who had embraced Unitarianism, that her *crime* was much more alarming than any open immorality. In another place, a man, who still adhered to Orthodoxy, was publicly excommunicated, because he sent his children to a Unitarian Sunday-school, and would not pronounce the Unitarian doctrine to be as bad as Deism and Atheism. But as you may want evidence of this assertion, I will give you an extract from a letter lately received by a gentleman in this vicinity from a most respectable Unitarian minister in another State. The

letter was written without any knowledge of my undertaking, and is now used by me without his knowledge or permission.

'"The Presbyterians are waging most bitter war against us; war to the very knife. There is no form of accusation or misrepresentation left untried; the same slandering of private character, and the same misrepresentations, of which you see something in Massachusetts. They are endeavouring to crush all freedom of thought and opinion. No longer than a week ago, a man, against whose moral and religious character not a single charge was brought, a man who is a presbyterian in his faith, was publicly excommunicated from the Presbyterian church; and these were the reasons, *viz.* That he had sent his children to a Unitarian Sunday-school, and on being questioned by the church sessions, had said, that he did not think the Unitarian belief was as bad as it had been represented; that is, as bad as Deism and Atheism. These were the reasons, as read from the pulpit, in full meeting for communion, for expelling a man from the Presbyterian church, The people are taught that it is wicked to hear a Unitarian preach, or read a Unitarian book. The Rev. Mr. ———, in a long and labored paragraph, puts on the same ground, permission granted by the presbytery for the people of their charge to hear Unitarian preaching, and permission granted by a father for his children to visit a brothel or gaming-table. He says, that those who are trained up in Unitarian sentiments, are trained up in the way to hell, to be damned. Every means that can prevent people from hearing, thinking, or knowing any thing of Unitarianism; every measure that can be devised and enforced, is put in operation. The terrors of church censure and hell-fire, things almost equally terrible, are made the instruments of barring men from thought and knowledge. Every thing like freedom of thought is crushed. This is what is to be feared; not Calvinistic doctrines, but this tyranny over men's opinions and consciences; a tyranny to the full as bad as any that could possibly proceed from the union of church and state; a tyranny that stretches across our land, blighting and withering, and making thousands and tens of thousands of unbelievers and hypocrites. *September*, 1830."'—pp. 48, 49.

'Three individuals of the first church in Newton removed some ten or fifteen years since into the town of Brighton. About a year ago, they requested a dismission from that church, and a recommendation to the Congregational church in the place of their residence. In answer to their request, the following absolute refusal was received.

'"*Rev. and Dear Sir,*

'"Your letter requesting the dismission and recommendation of three of our church members now residing in Brighton, has

been laid before this church. After mature deliberation, it was voted unanimously, 'that we do not comply with the request.' The reason for passing such a vote, was not because the three individuals were not in *good* CHRISTIAN *standing among us;* but the *sole* reason was, because we considered a compliance with your request '*manifestly unsafe.*' In thus voting, we have followed the directions given in the Cambridge Platform. That expressly declares, 'if a member's departure be manifestly *unsafe* and SINFUL, the church may not assent thereunto.'"

'Now had this said church read the whole of the paragraph from which this quotation is taken; and more especially, had they read a note by the Orthodox editor of the new edition of the Platform at the bottom of another page, they would have been obliged to invent some other excuse for their refusal. The individuals concerned perused these remarks, and in strict compliance with the rules of the Platform, provided for their case, joined the first church in Brighton. Whereupon, a bull of excommunication was thundered forth from the pulpit of the first church in Newton.' — p. 50.

At Brookfield, also, some Orthodox members of the Second Church seceded, and having done so, saw fit, in the next place, to go through the form of excommunicating their brethren whom they had left. But they did not stop here.

'After the vote of excommunication had been sent to the regular church-members, a letter of warning and reproof was also forwarded to each of the excluded individuals. I will give a copy of the letter sent by this said body of seceders to ten females at a still later period.

'"To Mrs. ———

'"With unfeigned solicitude for your most precious interests, *the church* are constrained to request you very seriously to consider the feelings and conduct which have placed you in your present situation. With affectionate concern, we beg you in the calm hour of serious reflection, to ask conscience, whether from regard to the will and command of your Lord, or from *other* considerations, you have ceased to commune and worship with us in the profession of that faith, which in connecting yourself with this church, you publicly declared to be the ground of your hope in God. Is it a light matter to *break from a covenant so solemn* in its nature as that into which *you entered with the Lord and this church;* the obligations of which you voluntarily assumed, and before God and man you religiously promised to fulfill? Whatever *others* may *pretend*, do *you* feel, that with *safety*, you

may release yourself at pleasure from the *bonds* of such a covenant; and without *any formality* adopt another essentially differing in articles of faith and rules of practice? Is this, we would ask, walking orderly as a member of Christ's church? And have you no *anxiety* how such a transaction is regarded by your Lord and Master? Let us not deceive ourselves. The whole of these proceedings will be reviewed in the great day. And in the realizing prospect of that awful scene, can you feel, that with an approving mind you will be able to answer to your Lord and Judge? *We pretend not to exercise dominion over your faith; nor would we retain you in our connexion contrary to your own inclinations. If we cannot walk by the same rule, it is best to be separate.* Still we cannot but consider it *awfully dangerous* to trifle with *solemn vows.* And as one with whom we were associated in endearing bonds; with whom we took delight in going to the house of God, and to the table of our Lord; and whose departure has occasioned deep regret, we cannot but earnestly desire, that if you are in a *dangerous error*, as we honestly believe you to be, that you may be convinced of it, and REPENT ere it be too late. And as the *last* expression of our faithfulness and regard, we entreat of you seriously to pause and consider." ' — pp. 52, 53.

But these women were not burnt at the stake, nor immured in dungeons, nor branded on the forehead, nor punished with outlawry. 'In no case whatever,' says Professor Stuart, 'do we believe that civil disabilities or penalties should be connected with any excommunication by a Christian church.' The Catholics in this country and in England say precisely the same thing, and say it as solemnly, as unreservedly, and, we are bound to believe, as sincerely.*

* 'Mr. Fox's principles of civil and religious liberty are known to have been of the most enlarged kind. On one occasion he desired the writer of these pages to attend him, to confer with him, as he condescended to say, on Catholic emancipation. He asked the writer "what he thought the best ground on which it could be advocated?" The writer suggested it to be — "that it is both unjust and detrimental to the state to deprive any portion of its subjects of their civil rights, on account of their religious principles, if these are not inconsistent with moral or civil duty." "No, Sir;" Mr. Fox said, with great animation; "that is not the best ground. The best ground — and the only ground to be defended in all parts — is, that *action*, not *principle*, is the object of law and legislation. With a person's principles no government has a right to interfere." "Am I then to understand," said the writer, wishing to bring the matter at once to issue by supposing an extreme case, "that in 1713, when the houses of Brunswick and Stuart were equally balanced, if a person published a book in which he attempted to prove, that the house of Hanover unlawfully possessed the

Now we will allow the declaration to prove as much in favor of Professor Stuart and his friends, as they will allow it to prove in favor of the Catholics, and no more. Will Professor Stuart and his friends admit, that the Catholics in this country and in England, though they do not resort to the civil power, and disclaim its interposition in religious matters, are not subject to influences which act as a restraint on their religious liberty? Civil disabilities and penalties are among the means, it is true, but they are not the only, nor the most efficient means, by which freedom of thought may be discouraged and checked. They do not chain up the mind, nor seal the lips. We may still think as we please, and speak as we please, if we are willing to risk the consequences. But they connect a sense of danger with the honest and fearless investigation of truth, and with an honest and fearless avowal of our convictions. Any thing which has this effect, and because it has this effect, is justly accounted an infringement of religious liberty, no matter whether the danger in question respects our property, persons, or character, our social, our civil, or our religious standing and prospects. It is essential to religious liberty, that every doctrine should be regarded as open to discussion; that we should feel ourselves responsible for nothing in the discussion but for the fairness and diligence with which it is conducted; and that there should be no influence whatever to incline us to one conclusion, rather than to another, but the evidence before us.

The ablest and boldest assertors of freedom in other countries have aimed their attacks mainly, as was natural, against the most obvious and palpable of the abuses under which

British throne, and that all who obeyed the prince on it, were morally criminal, he ought not to be punished by law?" "Government," said Mr. Fox, "should answer the book, but should not set its officers upon its author. No," he said, with great energy, and rising from his seat, "the more I think of the subject, the more I am convinced of the truth of my position — *action*, not *principle*, is the true object of government." In his excellent speech for the repeal of the test, Mr. Fox adopted this principle in its fullest extent; and enforced and illustrated it with an admirable union of argument and eloquence.' — *Butler's Memoirs of the Catholics*, Vol. IV, pp. 184, 185.

We do not give Mr. Fox's principles as those of a Catholic, but because they are interesting generally as the sentiments of a profound statesman on this subject, and because they are connected with an expression of Mr. Butler's own views, the well known champion of catholicity.

they were suffering, — against oppressive laws and institutions. This has left the impression on many, that religious liberty has nothing to fear except from the magistracy and hierarchy, and nothing to fear, of course, from any quarter, where the magistracy will not interfere, and where no legally constituted hierarchy exists. The truth is, however, that even in those Catholic states, in which the whole power of the government is directly or indirectly in the hands of priests, these men find it much easier to blind and subdue the people by spiritual menaces and terrors, than by the secular arm. In France, at the Revolution, when the doors of the religious houses were thrown open, it was found to have no effect on an immense majority, especially of the nuns, to tell them that, so far as civil disabilities or penalties were concerned, they were emancipated from their vows. There is no way, in which the mind can be shackled and enslaved so effectually, and so hopelessly, as by its own prejudices, superstitions, and fears. No matter by what means, and no matter under what laws and institutions, if a whole people, or a whole party, or a single church, are made to attach a sense of danger or guilt to an honest and fearless investigation of any subject, or to an honest and fearless avowal of the convictions to which such an investigation may lead, on that particular subject they are not free. Who cannot perceive, that this state of things may be brought about in any country, not only by intolerant laws and institutions, but by an intolerant party, or an intolerant creed, — by a system of exclusion, denunciations, and menace in religion?

Now we find no evidence in Professor Stuart's writings, that he means any thing more by religious liberty, than an exemption from legislative interference on the part of the government. It is true, he condemns a resort to 'slander and abuse' as a means of propagating one's religious opinions; but he condemns it as an offence against law, not liberty. In the eye of the civil government, he maintains, with some important exceptions however, that all persons should stand, nominally at least, on the same footing, whatever may be their religious opinions or ceremonies, or even though they may have none. That is to say, he would not have a man's religious liberty taken away at the expense of his civil liberty. This doctrine might help us to preserve the latter, or at least a semblance of it; but it would not insure us a continuance of even a semblance of the former. We doubt, indeed,

whether Professor Stuart has any clear conception of what constitutes religious liberty, considered as distinct from civil liberty, and capable of a distinct and independent vindication. He does not appear to understand what Dr. Channing means by freedom of thought, founded not on our civil and social relations, nor yet on any notion of expediency or practicability, but on an inborn, sacred, and inalienable right of private judgment in matters of conscience. His mind, we suspect, is not made up on the previous question, respecting the existence of such a right, — a right which no man, or body of men, can lose, give up, or forfeit in any case whatever, and which no man, or body of men, can attempt to restrain or overawe in any way whatever, or under any pretence whatever, without being guilty of usurpation. Judging from this Letter, and from other writings of his which have come under our notice, his views on the whole subject are not only defective and wrong in many respects, but vague and ill defined throughout. Hence the difficulties in the way of the theoretical argument, which to his mind, he confesses, are insuperable; hence the total inadequacy of the grounds on which he rests that degree of practical liberty, which he would allow; and hence also his frequent self-contradictions.

We are confident, indeed, that Professor Stuart's notions of religious liberty fall far short of Dr. Channing's, and are extremely vague, or he would not consent for a moment to the conditions on which he holds his professorship. According to the statutes of the foundation, he pledged himself at his installation, and must renew this pledge every five years, that he will interpret the Scriptures, and inculcate the Christian faith, so as to make them conform to a creed framed, we suppose he will allow, by 'frail, fallible, prejudiced mortals.' He may say, perhaps, that he submits to these conditions voluntarily, and that he has a right to do so, if he sees fit. Waiving for the present all discussion of these points, the question still arises, whether such conditions must not operate as a restraint on his liberty, as a religious teacher. Can he open and explain the Scriptures to his pupils, as God shall give him light, and inculcate any doctrine which further investigation may convince him is there revealed? He cannot. Then he is not free. It is to no purpose to say, that his liberty is restrained on a few points only, which the creed specifies, and that on all others he can teach what he pleases.

This is admitting that he has given up his liberty, if not wholly, at least in part; nay, that he has given up his liberty wholly in regard to those doctrines and principles, respecting which it is most important, that his instructions should not be liable even to the suspicion of unworthy biases. But perhaps it may be urged, that he is not bound by the statutes of the foundation, because he is not bound to the place, and can resign it at any moment. That is to say, he is not bound by these statutes as a man, but he is bound by them, beyond all question, as a professor. He can resign his place, and be free, but he cannot retain it and be so. The most plausible ground on which Professor Stuart's submission to such conditions can be defended is, that he is convinced, that the Scriptures really teach the doctrines embodied in the creed, and that he shall never see cause to alter this conviction. In this state of mind he is like a valetudinarian or hypocondriac, who has come to the conclusion that he shall never leave his chamber under any circumstances, and therefore thinks that it can make no difference to him, if his chamber be a prison.

Mr. Whitman has stated, with his usual clearness and force, in what way the solemn pledges given by Professor Stuart must abridge his freedom and independence.

'Now which is made your standard of religious truth, *as a Professor*, this human creed, or the Bible? The creed, surely. For should you refuse to profess your belief in all its statements, you could not be inducted into the office of Professor. And should you refuse to renew your assent every five years, you must be dismissed from the Seminary; although you should firmly adhere to the Bible, and offer to express your belief in the very words of inspiration, and continue to exhibit a Christian temper and character.

'And is not this use of the human creed subversive of free inquiry, religious liberty, and the principles of congregationalism? For, what inquiries have you liberty to pursue? Would you inquire into the truth of your creed, so as to correct any errors that may pertain to this human composition? No. This liberty you have sacrificed. You must never presume to make a single alteration in this human formulary; but you and your successors must sacredly use it as the perfect standard of religious truth FOR EVER. For so you are bound to conduct, by the following authoritative injunction from the constitution of your Seminary. "It is *strictly* and *solemnly* enjoined, and *left in sacred charge*, that *every* article of the *above said creed* shall

for ever remain *entirely* and *identically* the same, without the *least* alteration, addition, or diminution." — Would you inquire into the meaning of the Scriptures, so as to communicate to your pupils the result of your investigations? No. This liberty you have sacrificed. You have bound yourself most firmly to make your religious instructions conform exactly to the sentiments of the human creed. These are the words of your solemn obligation. "And furthermore I do solemnly promise, that I will open and explain the Scriptures to my pupils with integrity and faithfulness; that I will maintain and *inculcate the Christian faith, as expressed in the creed, by me now repeated.*" — Would you inquire into the peculiar religious opinions of other Christian denominations, so as to ascertain if their belief is not founded on the plain teachings of inspiration? No. This liberty you have sacrificed. You have pledged yourself to regard the sentiments of other sects as erroneous, and to defend your creed in opposition to all who dissent from any of its articles. These are the words of your sacred oath. "And furthermore I do solemnly promise, that I will *maintain* and inculcate the Christian faith, *as expressed in the creed, by me now repeated, — in opposition to* Papists, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians, and Universalists, and to *all other heresies and errors, ancient or modern.*" — Should a prayerful study of the Bible enable you to discover a slight error in some one article of this long creed, could you retain your situation as Professor? No. This liberty you have sacrificed. The moment you advance in religious knowledge and truth one step beyond the ideas of this human formulary, you must vacate your office; you must be cast on the wide world with a dependent family; you must encounter coldness and frowns and reproaches from your former associates; you must be privately and publicly denounced as an apostate, a heretic, an infidel; and above all, you must be sentenced to endless torments for your honest preference of the teachings of revelation to the articles of a human creed, if treated as others have been who have embraced Unitarianism. These are the words of your constitution. "The preceding Creed and Declaration shall be repeated by *every* Professor on this foundation, at the expiration of every successive period of five years; and *no man shall be continued a Professor on said foundation, who shall not continue to approve himself a man of sound and orthodox principles in divinity,* AGREEABLY TO THE AFORESAID CREED." Sir, is this the way you show your respect and reverence for the Bible? Is this the way you divest yourself of all party prejudices, when you proceed to search the

Scriptures? Is this the way you prepare yourself to investigate religious subjects with honesty, and boldness, and fearlessness? Is this the way you enjoy the meridian splendor of free inquiry, religious liberty, and the principles of congregationalism?

'But perhaps you will aver, that there is no possible danger of your ever dissenting from the sentiments of this human creed. Then why all these fortifications? And have not many divines, as wise, as learned, as honest, as pious as yourself, been led, by a patient and prayerful study of the Scriptures, to renounce their belief in the peculiarities of your standard of religious truth? Is it not a fact, that one of the principal founders of your institution, one of the principal framers of this very creed, and one of the earliest Professors in your seminary, became a Liberal Christian after dissolving his connexion with your theological faculty, and warmly opposed to many of your illiberal and exclusive measures? Is it not a fact, that several ministers, who pursued the regular course of theological studies in your institution, and who were regarded as amongst the most talented, the most learned, the most sincere, the most pious of your students, have since embraced Unitarian sentiments? Is it not a fact, that several others, of high standing and good Christian character, were led to renounce Orthodox views, even before they had completed the usual term of education in your Seminary? Is it not a fact, that many of the most distinguished Unitarian preachers of the age were once as zealously orthodox as you now are? Is it not a fact, that every year witnesses the conversion of more or fewer orthodox ministers to the Unitarian faith? And could you be placed in similar circumstances, what would prevent similar results? I do not mean to insinuate that you are knowingly influenced by your peculiar oaths and obligations to make the Scriptures bend to the articles of your creed. But I must be permitted to declare, that almost all earthly motives which can operate on the human heart, combine to make it your interest to find none but orthodox views in the Bible?" — pp. 6 — 8.

One would suppose that a proper sense of human frailty, and the obligations of truth, would prevent Professor Stuart from exposing his mind to influences that must have a tendency, to say the least, to disturb the perfectly even and just balance, in which doubtful and conflicting testimonies and authorities should be weighed. His moral and religious principles may convince us, that he will not allow himself to be biased and corrupted knowingly by such influences; but what security can the public or his pupils have, nay what

security can he himself have, that he will not be biased and corrupted by them unconsciously? The Professors at Andover are understood to investigate thoroughly the great controverted doctrines of the day; and the results of these investigations would be entitled to much respect, if we did not know beforehand, by the rules and statutes of their respective foundations, what these results must be. We have no wish to detract at all from Professor Stuart's well-earned reputation for learning and ability; but on these doctrines what avails it? 'Fabulas et errores ab imperitis parentibus discimus; et, quod est gravius, ipsis studiis et disciplinis elaboramus.' Still it is not unlikely that Professor Stuart honestly believes, that the interests of truth, or at least of Orthodoxy, forbid that a public teacher of Christianity, in these days of daring speculation and constant change, should be allowed to throw off the trammels of a creed. He holds, perhaps, that it may be right, consistent, and safe in Unitarians to assert and enjoy such freedom, but that it would not be right, consistent, or safe in the Orthodox. Orthodoxy, he may think, would not long survive in this country, if theological professors everywhere were left without any other guide or standard in their investigations, and teachings, but the Bible. He may, therefore, disown and reject entire religious liberty, on principle; but if he does so, let him take this ground ingenuously, openly, and fearlessly. Let him not disown and reject entire religious liberty, in theory and practice, and on principle too; and in the same breath deny that he has disowned and rejected it, and claim to be regarded as its friend.

The same want of precision and accuracy which Professor Stuart evinces in what he says of religious liberty, he also shows, in speaking of the charges which Dr. Channing has brought against its violators. He even mistakes, or affects to mistake, the persons of the accused. He says in his Letter;

'I take it for granted that you yourself are altogether too frank and ingenuous, even to pretend that you did not mean to characterize Orthodox Christians in general throughout this State, and in particular the clergy who belong to this denomination of Christians. And I take this for granted, because I cannot help believing that no Unitarian who reads your writings, has ever once suspected, or ever will suspect, that you meant to characterize any other than the Orthodox; and no

Orthodox man who reads the whole of your works, can possibly suppose otherwise. You aim at *real* existences, not *imaginary*, *future*, *fantastic* ones; I mean those which you believe to be real. The friends with whom I am accustomed to think and act, do not once suspect you of laying out your energies, in belaboring what you believe to be "a man of straw." ' — p. 8.

In another place he says;

'In some solitary passages, you allow, for decency's sake, and in order to save the appearance of *liberality*, that there are some among us who have a share of common sense in respect to most subjects, and a few that have a little smattering of what the world deems learning; possibly two or three Orthodox individuals may be found, in the whole State, that have a small degree of cultivated taste. But in other passages almost without number, you rank the whole together, and fearlessly avow that none but bigots, and those who have bid adieu to what little understanding they possessed, can be found in the ranks of Orthodoxy. And what is more than all, some of your partial friends applaud this, and call it bold and fearless declaration of the truth, and the developement of high and commanding genius.' — p. 10.

Again, he says;

'If now you can establish the *facts*, which you have alleged, and which go to make up the charges in question, in respect to the Orthodox as a body in this Commonwealth, confession and humiliation in this whole affair undoubtedly will belong to us. If you cannot prove it of the *whole*, then the sweeping accusations which you have made are to be modified, greatly modified.' — p. 39.

Are we then to believe that Dr. Channing has denounced the "whole" Orthodox denomination as fools, bigots, and persecutors, and that he has done this in "passages almost without number." Professor Stuart knows better. Dr. Channing has spoken repeatedly and with great plainness of Calvinism generally, and its moral aspects and tendencies; but in doing so he has been careful to say that he was not speaking of Calvinists, nor of the actual influences of the system in this community. He believes, and he has said again and again, that, in a well-informed community like ours, the natural and legitimate tendencies of the system are modified in all cases, and sometimes almost entirely neutralized,

by the operation of other causes. At the same time we do not mean to deny, that he has occasionally spoken of men, and of a party, and denounced their measures as subversive of free inquiry and religious liberty. But this party is not the whole Orthodox denomination, nor the Orthodox denomination as a body. It is the Exclusive party, a party organized and spread over the whole country, composed of members belonging to different sects, and holding different opinions, but agreeing in this, that the Christian name and all Christian privileges and fellowship shall be withheld from those who do not come up to a certain standard, which they in their wisdom, or their presumption, have seen fit to prescribe. This party was introduced and established in Massachusetts but about twenty years ago; and up to this hour, it has hardly brought over to a cordial coöperation in its views a majority of the Orthodox clergy, and not one twentieth part of the Orthodox laity. It was this party which in 1815 proposed to institute a Plan of Ecclesiastical Order amongst us, but was resisted, and utterly defeated in the attempt, by the almost unanimous voice of the Orthodox churches. It is this party which has been presenting petition after petition to the General Court, in the hope of obtaining legislative countenance and sanction, in some form or other, to its exclusive measures; but its projects have been exposed and rejected in every instance by overwhelming majorities. It is this party, which, for some years back, has been bringing forward a succession of exclusive and schismatic resolutions in the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers, but has never been so far supported by the Orthodox as to be able to carry them through, though more than two thirds of the Convention are of that denomination. It is of this party that the Rev. Mr. Withington of Newbury, himself a distinguished Orthodox divine, speaks as follows;

'"To illustrate our manners, if ever this book should fall into the hands of a foreigner, let me mention in a note, a circumstance which is certainly unworthy of a place in the text. In Massachusetts, for a few years past, all ecclesiastical measures have been prepared *in a certain conclave*, nobody knows who they are, or where they are, invisible beings, *congregational cardinals, to whose decrees every Orthodox clergyman and church is expected to pay unlimited deference and submission.* But as

they are wholly destitute of power, they have found out a singular way of executing their laws. *The clergyman, who hesitates,* OR DARES TO THINK OR ACT FOR HIMSELF, suddenly finds himself surrounded by the whisper, that he is becoming an UNITARIAN. It is not easy to conceive the horror and dismay, that this suggestion occasions. It is caught from mouth to mouth, and whispered from ear to ear, and every ghastly relater increases the terrors of the tale. The poor, affrighted victim must either return to the bosom of the church, *the popular measure of the day, or be denounced a heretic,* worthy of all the flames that detraction can kindle; for, in this country, we burn heretics in no other." ' — *Cited by Whitman,* p. 24.

The views entertained of this party by many Orthodox clergymen who are constrained by threatening and intimidation to come into its plans, and submit to its impositions, may be gathered from an incident of recent occurrence.

' The circumstances are briefly these. A Unitarian minister of Salem, in company with an influential layman of Andover, called on an Orthodox minister of Middlesex county, to obtain an exchange for the following Sabbath. As the Orthodox minister had before preached in Salem, he addressed to him the following observation; "I hope you are not getting into the exclusive system." The reply contained the following sentiments, according to the testimony of the layman now before me. "I *abhor* the *system,* but am *compelled* to enter into it; for THEY have told me, if I do not join them, *they will fall upon me and break up my parish.*" The layman immediately repeated this very appropriate proverb; "The fear of man bringeth a snare." ' — p. 19.

Professor Stuart may have had his reasons, though not a shadow of evidence, for representing Dr. Channing as assailing the whole Orthodox denomination. It would give to many of his remarks an air of extravagance and injustice, excite against him in a large and respectable body of Christians a feeling of personal injury and affront, and blind the public generally, not only to the merits of the controversy, but to the real question at issue, and the parties implicated. We repeat it, however, the party aimed at by Dr. Channing is not the Orthodox, but the Exclusive party, a party still inconsiderable, at least in Massachusetts, so far as numbers are concerned; but formidable from its talent, activity, and unscrupulous zeal, and especially from the undue influence it has gained over Orthodox institutions and publications. In

this vicinity, it has been formed and managed, for the most part, by strangers, by men who have come among us from other states, though in their attempts to remodel our notions and usages according to those under which they were educated, they have found it convenient to talk very familiarly about 'Old Massachusetts,' and the 'Home of the Pilgrims,' and to say, '*we*.' Now Dr. Channing has had the temerity to think and say, that, in matters of religion and conscience, it is not precisely the thing to be expected or desired, that the great body of native citizens of this Commonwealth should submit to the dictation of such a 'conclave.'

In resisting the measures and exposing the policy of these men, he has also found it necessary to charge them, either directly or by implication, with endeavouring, perhaps under the influence of a sincere though mistaken zeal for religion, to restrain and overawe a fair and free investigation of truth. This they have not been so weak as to think of doing in this country by civil penalties and disabilities, but by attempting to institute among us new ecclesiastical judicatories, by a frequent infliction of ecclesiastical censures and penalties for mere differences of opinion, and by calumny, denunciation, and menace.

With regard to the attempt which was made by the party in question to introduce among us new ecclesiastical judicatories, in imitation of the Consociations of Connecticut, Dr. Channing, in 1815, expressed himself thus;

'We are now threatened with new tribunals, or Consociations, whose office it will be to try ministers for their errors, to inspect the churches, and to advise and assist them in the extirpation of "heresy." Whilst the laity are slumbering, the ancient and free constitution of our churches is silently undermined, and is crumbling away. Since argument is insufficient to produce uniformity of opinion, recourse must be had to more powerful instruments of conviction; I mean, to ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS. And are this people indeed prepared to submit to this most degrading form of vassalage; a vassalage, which reaches and palsies the mind, and imposes on it the dreams and fictions of men, for the everlasting truth of God!' — *Discourses, &c.*, p. 566.

This passage contains one of those accusations, of which Professor Stuart says, 'I do know that' they 'are not true. I aver that they are not, before heaven and earth.' Not satisfied with a general denial of this particular charge, he

reverts to the subject afterwards, and makes it the occasion of some ill-timed pleasantry.

'In respect to such of us as profess to be Congregationalists, neither yourself, nor any man on earth, has a right to deny that we are sincere in this profession. How, then, can we have it in view to erect *ecclesiastical judicatories and courts which are to try and punish heretics as criminals?* Why, Sir, the suggestion of such a thing among *Congregationalists*, is just as if one were to ask, under the present form of our government in this State, "What day is appointed for the *coronation* of the Governor?" And the fact that you even suggest such a thing, shows, either that you regard us as hypocrites in professing to be Congregationalists; or — shall I say it? — that you make assertions of this nature, without even knowing what Congregationalism admits or rejects.' — p. 40.

That the tribunals in question are really inconsistent with Congregationalism, Dr. Channing not only knew, but expressly affirmed, in the very paragraph, which Professor Stuart has cited from his writings. But he also knew, that there were those professing to be Congregationalists, who held, and acted on, a different doctrine. Has Professor Stuart forgotten, that the consociated churches in his native State call themselves Congregational, and that they are consociated for the special purpose of establishing a regular and permanent ecclesiastical court or judicatory of the kind which Dr. Channing has denounced? Has he no recollection of the case of the Rev. Abiel Abbot, formerly minister of Coventry, who was tried before the Consociation of Tolland County, in 1811, on a charge of heresy, and found guilty and deposed? Will he deny, in the face of the record, that this minister, with a character as unimpeachable in other respects as that of any one of his brethren in the State, was 'tried' before an '*ecclesiastical court*' for his supposed errors in belief, and condemned and 'punished'? Suppose that Mr. Abbot had been deposed by a civil and not by an ecclesiastical court, and for a crime against the State and not against religion. In this case, it is true, he would have been tried and punished under a different jurisdiction, and for a different sort of crime; but it is not true, that there would have been any more reason to say, that he had been tried and punished, or that he had been tried and punished as a criminal. It is to no purpose to object here, that the

churches in Connecticut consociated voluntarily; that it was in all respects, so far as the churches were concerned, a voluntary arrangement; a measure which was not forced upon them, but one which they adopted of their own accord, believing it to be expedient and right. We are not now inquiring how tribunals, like those which Dr. Channing has described, have been introduced and established, or on what principles they are defended, but whether they have ever really existed among such 'as profess to be Congregationalists.' Professor Stuart will hardly presume to aver again, that they have not. Whence then this bluster, and affectation of astonishment, at the pretended inconsistency and absurdity of Dr. Channing's imputations.

It would be well for Professor Stuart if his responsibility in regard to these imputations ended here. Dr. Channing, writing in 1815, had taken the liberty to warn the public against a project, which was known to be on foot at that time, to introduce and establish among the Congregational churches of this State something like the Connecticut plan of Consociations. As this project, in all its details, exhibits in a strong light the principles and real aim of the Exclusive party, we shall give from Mr. Whitman's letters a succinct and well digested narration of the facts.

'In 1814, a body of Orthodox ministers assembled in Dorchester. There were twenty-four belonging to this Commonwealth, as delegates from twelve ministerial associations. They called themselves the *General* Association of Massachusetts; by what right or authority, I am unable to determine. There were also present two delegates from the Presbyterian church; and two from each of the Orthodox Conventions of Connecticut, Vermont, and New Hampshire. Some of the leaders of the Massachusetts delegation wished to introduce the Connecticut system of Consociations; but they well knew, that an open avowal of their design would be rejected by many of their own denomination. They accordingly commenced their undertaking by passing the following votes. "Voted, to hear and take order upon the measures proposed in an ancient document, prepared 'to serve the great intentions of religion, which is lamentably decaying in the country,' by the ministers of Massachusetts, convened in Boston in the year 1704, 5, and 6." The following vote was then passed unanimously. "Whereas an ancient document has been presented to this Association, containing an answer to the question, 'What further steps are to be taken, that councils may have

their due constitution and efficacy, in supporting, preserving, and well ordering the interests of the churches in this country?' and assented to by the delegates of the Associations met according to former agreement at Boston, September 13th, 1705, and 'further approved and confirmed by a general Convention of ministers at Boston, 30th 3d month, 1706'—Voted, that a committee of seven be chosen by ballot, to inquire into the history of the abovementioned document; and particularly to ascertain, whether the resolves it contains were carried into execution at the time, and to what extent; *and to report at the next annual meeting of this Association, on the expediency of a recommendation by this body of the plan of discipline therein proposed, either entire, or with alterations and amendments,* to the consideration of the associations and churches in our connexion. Rev. Jedidiah Morse, D. D., Rev. Samuel Austin, D. D.. Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., Rev. Samuel Worcester, D. D., Rev. Enoch Hale, Rev. Joseph Lyman, D. D., and the Rev. Timothy M. Cooley, were chosen a committee for the purpose above specified." Such was the display, and caution, and management necessary to bring forward the proposed change in the government of our congregational churches.

'After the passing of these votes, the publishing committee were directed to print and distribute a hundred and fifty copies of the minutes of the Association. They performed the specified duty, and appended to the minutes a copy of the famous document. They assure us, that it has never before been published to their knowledge, and that it is "an INVALUABLE RELIC of our pious forefathers." Now the history of this invaluable relic is soon related. It was a plan for the destruction of our congregational form of church government, drawn up by Cotton Mather, and raked out of his musty papers. It was printed soon after it was written, by the Rev. John Wise, of Ipswich. It was recommended to the adoption of the churches in that early period, and by them quickly rejected. And why? Let Cotton Mather answer for himself. "There were *some very considerable persons among the ministers, as well as of the brethren, who thought the liberties of particular churches to be in danger of being limited and infringed by its adoption. In deference to these,* the proposals were never prosecuted beyond the bounds of mere proposals." All this should have been known to some one or more of the General Association who make such pretences to an acquaintance with the proceedings of our Pilgrim fathers. Still all this parade and artifice were necessary to keep the suspicions of the free people of this State in profound quiet, and receive the attention and coöperation of the more liberal of the Orthodox denomination.'—pp. 32, 33.

The General Association met at Royalston on the twenty-seventh of June, 1815, and the committee who were to inquire into the history of the 'invaluable' document, reported that its proposals were such as Congregational ministers could not consistently recommend or approve. They went on, however, to speak of the defects in the existing system of ecclesiastical discipline, and dwelt particularly on our want of a competent and acknowledged tribunal before which whole churches might be arraigned and tried on a charge of 'apostasy,' and 'of a settled and effectual method of calling ministers to account for immorality and *error*.' The committee concluded with proposing 'a Plan of Ecclesiastical Order.'

'Well, Sir,' Mr. Whitman continues, 'after this elaborate report had been read, the Association chose the Rev. Drs. Morse, Codman, and Woods, a committee to have it printed and circulated in the several associations in their connexion, "*for the purpose of ascertaining the* PUBLIC *sentiment respecting the plan of ecclesiastical order therein presented.*" And what is the character of this new plan? The committee recommend, that *the churches shall explicitly adopt and put in practice the following articles of agreement.* — *First*, the propositions of the synod of 1662 are acknowledged as the *basis of Consociations*. *Secondly*, particular Consociations shall be formed within certain limits. In this article there is a wonderfully generous provision, that churches *not* joining the Consociation shall *not be treated* as parties. *Thirdly*, provision is made for the regular meetings of the new ecclesiastical tribunal. *Fourthly*, each Consociation is indulged with the privilege of choosing its own moderator and scribe. *Fifthly*, this constitution is declared to be the constitution of all Consociations in the general body; yet each separate Consociation has the privilege of adopting such regulations as are not repugnant to this constitution; that is, saving in all cases the papal power and supremacy. *Sixthly*, by this extraordinary article, the *Consociation* is substituted for *mutual* councils in *all* ages, and without the express consent of the parties; and in defiance of our State constitution and republican principles, is declared to be the *legal* and competent tribunal for the following solemn purposes: — *to hear and decide upon any complaint* and allegation, touching ministerial character, against any minister belonging to it; to *acquit* or *find guilty*, to *advise*, *maintain*, or DEPOSE, as the case may require. Then comes the quintessence of ecclesiastical despotism. It is to be understood, however, that any Consociation may provide, upon principles and for reasons dis-

tinctly to be made known to them, for *cases* in which it may not be *expedient* for *all the members* to be concerned; as also for *cases*, in which it may be proper for *others not of the body*, to be admitted to sit in the council. Now, what are the true and only purposes of this formal and technical rule, when reduced to plain English? Simply these. The Consociation is, to all future time, made by a fiction the *mutual* choice of both parties; but through fear that heresy might even infect the Consociation itself, it is provided, that the Consociation may exclude any member at pleasure from any trial, and admit others not members of the particular Consociation to sit therein. That is, it is permitted to each Consociation in all cases to *pack a jury*, provided it be for the justifiable purpose of deposing an heretical minister. There was, indeed, a right of appeal to two or more neighbouring Consociations, except for private church members; they were to be condemned without appeal. Such is a bare synopsis of this proposed plan of ecclesiastical order.

'Now what is proved by the history of this report? First, that the committee who drew it up consisted of the ablest men in the denomination. Secondly, that they approved their own plan, and wished it carried into execution. Thirdly, that the Association so far approved of its scope, design, principles, and objects, as to submit it to the associations in their connexion. And, fourthly, that the new plan of ecclesiastical order contained all the worst features of the Connecticut system of Consociations.' — pp. 35, 36.

'And how was this plan of ecclesiastical order received by the community? With marked disapprobation. It produced nearly as much talk and excitement throughout the Commonwealth, as the recent revolutions in Europe are now producing among our free citizens. Its adoption was opposed by all classes of society; and especially by some distinguished individuals of Orthodox sentiments. Among others, one of the founders of your Seminary, the Rev. Dr. Spring of Newburyport, attacked the plan with great power and success. He declares in his pamphlet, that "the plan of ecclesiastical order is not authorized by reason or revelation"; that it is not "friendly to the liberty and rights of conscience"; that it "will invest clergymen especially with more influence over their churches than they ought to possess"; that it is an infringement of the rights of distinct branches of the church and of individual brethren"; that "it exceeds the plan of the Fathers very far indeed, by placing the communion of churches under the care and management of standing councils or Consociations; and by making all ministers in the connexion amenable directly to the Consociation, instead of their own church and occasional

councils"; and "that, if it succeed, it will introduce a revolution amid our churches." "On the whole," says the Doctor, "we sincerely think, that the genius and habits of the good people of this State are so averse to arbitrary and aristocratic government or domination, that the measures contemplated will not meet that share of public approbation, which promises utility to Zion." Is not this Orthodox authority sufficient to convince you that Dr. Channing uttered the truth, and nothing but the truth, when he published the following sentence, which you have so often quoted and ridiculed. "It is a melancholy fact, that our long established Congregational form of church government is menaced, and tribunals unknown to our churches, and unknown, as we believe, to the Scriptures, are to be introduced; and introduced for the very purpose, that the supposed errors and mistakes of ministers and private Christians may be tried and punished as heresies, that is, as crimes." The writings of Dr. Spring and Dr. Channing did much to awaken public attention to the threatened danger. But a publication of the Hon. John Lowell produced a much greater effect; because it gave a full view of the enormous evils to be inflicted on the churches by the new plan of ecclesiastical order; and because it was published in several different parts of the Commonwealth, and in this manner very generally circulated through the community. So that this wonderful child of many fathers barely breathed to expire under the maledictions of a free Christian people.' — pp. 36, 37.

Candid men of all parties, on becoming acquainted with these facts, will entirely concur, we are sure, with Mr. Whitman in the following severe but just animadversions in his concluding paragraph on this subject.

'Now, Sir, permit me to ask you a few friendly questions. In your treatment of Dr. Channing on this particular point, have you not been guilty of *singular unfairness?* Just review the circumstances of the case. An attempt was made by the leaders of the Orthodox party, in 1815, to change the ecclesiastical order of our congregational churches. At the very time, Dr. Channing wrote an able article to prevent its success. Distinguished men of Orthodox sentiments entertained similar views of the design, and also warned the community to guard against the threatened danger. By such noble exertions, a great excitement was produced throughout the Commonwealth, and the nefarious attempt was blown to perdition. After fifteen years Dr. Channing collects most of his writings into a large volume; and among other articles, republishes the above mentioned essay, taking special care to date it, *eighteen hundred*

and fifteen. In that essay he simply asserts what every body knew to be literally true at the time of publication. As soon as this volume is well before the public, with much blustering you boldly declare, that this assertion of Dr. Channing is not true. You bring forward the quotation several times, and ridicule the idea of any such attempt on the part of the Orthodox. You treat an opinion of fifteen years' standing, which was an undisputed truth at the time of its publication, as the sentiment of the present year. Is not this most singular unfairness?' — p. 38.

The avowed object of the Exclusive party in endeavouring to introduce a new plan of ecclesiastical order was to provide more prompt and effectual means for enforcing discipline, especially in regard to reputed heresies, or defections from the popular faith. Failing utterly, however, in this attempt, they were obliged to fall back on the usual modes of inflicting ecclesiastical censures and penalties; but these modes they contrived to make much more efficient and formidable than heretofore, by incorporating into church covenants a more full and exact statement of their belief, and by keeping a strict watch, not only over the conduct, but over the feelings and opinions of church members. Thus do they continue to adhere to the forms of Congregationalism; but not, as we conceive, without violating its spirit, and going contrary to the principles and precedents of the Pilgrim fathers. We cannot resist the inclination to quote a passage from the mass of interesting testimonies and documents on this subject with which Mr. Whitman has favored the public.

'A good authority thus observes. "While they take care, according to Apostolic injunction, that all things be done decently and in order, it *is their duty not to impose any thing, by way of subscription or declaration of faith, upon those who desire admission to the ordinances, which may not be conscientiously complied with by sincere Christians of all denominations.*" Your friend, Dr. Hawes, has also declared, that the Pilgrims "*acted on the principle of open communion; making evidence of Christian character the* ONLY *condition of fellowship!*" I thank the gentleman for what little truth his *tribute* contains. I suppose this evidence is sufficient; but I choose to advance more. I will give you a specimen of covenants adopted by our Pilgrim fathers, to convince you, that they did not hedge up the entrance to the Lord's table with doctrinal tests and human standards of divine truth; but that they opened the door to all sincere Christians of every denomination. The church first planted in Plymouth was organized

before they reached our shores. The covenant they then adopted has not been preserved. But about fifty years after their landing, a public fast was held, and they renewed their covenant engagements. The records of the church thus read. "A church covenant was read; and the church voted, that it should be left on record *as that which they did own to be the substance of that covenant, which their fathers entered into at the first gathering of the church;* which was in the words following.

'"In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in obedience to his holy ordinances, we being by the most wise and good providence of God brought together in this place, and desirous to unite ourselves into one congregation or church, under the Lord Jesus Christ our Head, that we may be in such root as becometh all those whom he hath redeemed and sanctified to himself, we do hereby solemnly and religiously, as in his most holy presence, avouch the Lord Jehovah, the only true God, to be our God and the God of ours; and do promise and bind ourselves to walk in all our ways according to the rule of the Gospel, and in all sincere conformity to his holy ordinances, and in mutual love to, and watchfulness over one another, depending wholly and only upon the Lord our God to enable us by his grace hereunto."' pp. 131, 132.

Mr. Whitman subjoins authentic copies of the original covenants of the first church in Salem, and the first church in Boston, which are equally free with that of Plymouth from every thing which looks like pledging the communicants to a particular profession of faith.

With these documents before us it is hardly possible not to perceive, that the creed-covenants adopted in most Orthodox churches are a wide departure from the principles of primitive Congregationalism. Professor Stuart may say, that every member of an Orthodox church knows, on entering it, what are the special obligations which he incurs; so that, if he fails to fulfil them, he has no right so complain at being ejected. This, however, admitting it to be true in its full extent, would only prove, that the individual after having voluntarily submitted to such an arrangement, has no just ground of complaint, so far as he is personally concerned; but it would not prove, or imply in any way, that the arrangement itself is not illiberal and intolerant. Besides, from what is he ejected? Not merely from a private society calling itself the church; not merely from a voluntary association of men and women bound together by certain articles of

agreement, and conditions of membership, — but from public religious ordinances, in which he believes it to be not only his right, but his duty to join. Nobody doubts, we presume, that a number of persons holding Orthodox opinions, have a right to form themselves into a voluntary association, and make an assent to these opinions a condition of membership; and having done so, they have a right to exclude all such as will not adopt these opinions, or have discarded them, from the privileges of the association. We say, from the privileges of the association; by which we mean the privileges which belong to the association exclusively, or which it has an undisputed prerogative to bestow or withhold according to its pleasure. If, not satisfied with doing this, it proceeds to exclude men, merely on the ground of its conditions of membership, not only from the privileges of the association, but from the Christian ordinances, its members are guilty of precisely the same sort of usurpation in religion, which our forefathers were guilty of in civil matters, when they excluded all who did not belong to the church from the rights of freemen and citizens.

It is to no purpose to urge, therefore, that the Exclusive party has renounced all intention to resort to civil disabilities and penalties, as a means of checking the growth of heresy, and is resolved at length to rely altogether on religious disabilities and penalties. The former is not more a usurpation than the latter, and the practical tendency of both alike is to repress freedom of thought, and deter men from an open and fearless avowal of their convictions. Dr. Channing never said, or intimated, that it was part of the policy of Exclusionists in this state to call in the civil power to forbid and restrain the free and unbiased investigation of truth; but he has charged them with resorting to other expedients for this purpose, and among the rest, as we have seen, to an abuse of ecclesiastical discipline.

Another means of restraining Christian liberty and preventing the free and unbiased investigation of truth, of which the more zealous and unscrupulous of the Exclusive party have not hesitated to avail themselves, has been personal detraction and obloquy. We do not refer here to their denial of the Christian name and character to Unitarians on account of their belief, but to the suspicions which they have endeavoured to propagate, respecting the honesty and

sincerity of Unitarian ministers, and liberal Christians generally.

'So many instances of this kind now rush on my recollection,' says Mr. Whitman, 'that I find it difficult to make a selection. One example is this. A Unitarian minister, the son of an Orthodox clergyman, was ordained over a society in Plymouth county. An Orthodox Christian in the vicinity took pains to circulate the report, that this man preached his father's Orthodox sermons; and that there was an open disagreement between the sentiments of his discourses and his Unitarian prayers. — Another instance is this. An Orthodox deacon in Middlesex county reported that a Unitarian minister in a neighbouring town had declared to his people, that he did not believe a word of the Bible. — A third case is this. An Orthodox clergyman in this county informed a lady who had left his meeting, that the Unitarian preacher in the same town preached sentiments which he did not himself believe. — A fourth instance is this. Two Orthodox ministers were travelling in the stage with two Unitarian church-members. One of them asserted, that the present Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and Pastoral Care in the University at Cambridge, then residing in Europe for his health, had renounced Christianity, and become an infidel. — As a fifth example, I will take one of the multitude which have been circulated respecting myself. The Orthodox minister in this place has lately stated, that when I was journeying in New Hampshire, last season, I called at the house of an Orthodox lady; that she asked me if I "was willing to enter the eternal world with my present views and feelings"; that after remaining silent and thoughtful some time, I boldly answered — "No," I was not willing. Whether the Reverend gentleman believed this story when he circulated it or not, is not for me to determine. I must however say, that had I believed a similar report concering him, I should not have whispered it about among a few females; but I should have felt it my duty to expose his hypocrisy by proclaiming the evidence on the house-top. I now declare that the statement is an absolute falsehood, made out of whole cloth, having not even the shadow of a circumstance in truth for a foundation.' — pp. 94, 95.

'Take a notorious instance which occurred about two years since. The circumstances are briefly these. The Rev. Mr. Hubbard, a minister of acknowledged Orthodox sentiments, and late pastor of the church in Middleton, was invited to a re-settlement over the congregational society in Lunenburg. It was generally known to his ministerial brethren, that he was in the practice of exchanging with Unitarians. This circumstance *alone* induc-

should make the most of the palliations, which they can find for their conduct in human frailty, in the authorities by which they have been misled, or in the power of prejudice and passion to blind men to the force, not only of argument, but of evidence. Still as Unitarians have been pursued, year after year, with a storm of abuse of this description, and as it has found its way into some of the most widely circulated Orthodox publications, one or two of which appear to have been instituted, and to be supported, for the special purpose of slandering liberal Christians, it is believed that we have a right to look upon it as among the means, by which not a few in the party would enforce the exclusive system. Indeed Professor Stuart himself admits as much as this, if we understand him aright, in a passage which does him more credit than any other in his Letter, and accords, it is but justice to add, with his general reputation, and the tenor of his numerous and valuable writings.

'I am ready to concede, on my part, that I have seen and read things among the Orthodox, the manner of which I in some respects heartily disapproved. I have never thought, that to rail at our opponents was either Christian or courteous. Above all, every reflecting man must say, Nothing can be more improbable, than that this kind of proceeding will be likely to convince those who differ from us. Who will hear us with patience, when we begin our reproof by letting him know that we think him either a fool or a knave?

'I am not blinded to this by party zeal. I have seen some of it among those whom I warmly love and greatly respect. Perhaps I may have shown some of this same disposition in my own writings. If so, produce it, and I will tread that part under my feet, and make my atonement by unfeigned sorrow to an injured public, and to the injured cause of Christ. But if I have indulged in such a mode of writing, I am unconscious of it to myself. I disapprove it; I even abhor it; and yet I know that I am not proof against temptation, and that I am exposed to all the weaknesses and faults of those around me.' — pp. 22, 23.

Still he thinks that there is 'nothing in any recent' Orthodox publications, 'which can well compare,' in this respect, with offensive passages in which the works of popular and distinguished Unitarians abound. Though aware how differently men in general are struck with the moral tone of controversial pieces, especially when able and spirited, according as they support or impugn their own views, we did not

expect, we confess, that Professor Stuart would venture to put the question at issue on this ground. That respectable and distinguished Unitarians, writing under strong provocations, have sometimes used expressions, which to their opponents appear unjust and contumelious, and to the sober and dispassionate, harsh and ill-advised, is not improbable. It is remarkable, however, of their most intemperate sallies, that, unlike the specimens which have been given of Orthodox misrepresentation and abuse, they are generally directed against opinions and not against men; and when directed against men, they are almost invariably in self-defence, and proceed on known and approved laws of evidence, and never, absolutely never, impute to the other party generally a total want either of moral or religious character. Besides, who was it, that, in 1815, began this war of recrimination? It is not enough considered, that in this controversy the Exclusionists are responsible not only for the false and injurious charges, which they have brought against Unitarians, but for the vehemence and indignation, with which these charges have sometimes been repelled. When all, who dared to reject the popular doctrine of the trinity, were stigmatized as the enemies of truth, and infidels in disguise, there were those who thought that a necessity, a stern necessity, was laid on them either to succumb to the aggressors, or denounce them as bigots. Professor Stuart speaks of '*recent* Orthodox publications,' as if there had been some improvement, of late, in that quarter; of which, however, we regret to say, that we cannot discern the faintest indication. We are not ignorant that the Exclusionists of New England, for some years back, have been gradually verging towards Unitarianism; but in the same proportion as they have done so, and probably to save their reputation for Orthodoxy with their brethren at the South, their virulence against Unitarians has been growing more and more bitter and concentrated.

There is, moreover, one form of denunciation, to which Exclusionists are addicted, and which Professor Stuart does not disclaim; nay, which he thinks to justify, if we understand him aright, on the ground of principle and consistency. Unitarians are represented as apostates from Christianity, and as having forfeited all title to the Christian name, and to Christian rights and privileges. On this subject Mr. Whitman has given us several apt quotations, accompanied by re-

marks of his own, which are pertinent and characteristic, but to which we have room merely to refer our readers.

We never could understand why a man's religious or Christian character should not be accounted as sacred and inviolable against wanton or unauthorized imputations, as his character in other respects. If Unitarians, in their conduct, evince a disregard for the Scriptures, or infidelity to Christ, or a want of piety, the public should know it. Let it be remembered, however, that it is a question not of doctrines and theories, but of charcter and life. We profess to be Christians; and Professor Stuart will admit that Christians, as such, are entitled to certain privileges, and have certain rights. These privileges we ask, these rights we demand, until our claims are disproved and rejected by a competent tribunal.

Professor Stuart seems to be aware of the correctness of this proposition, when it must be taken to protect Exclusionists from what he regards as unauthorized aspersions; for he asks Dr. Channing,

'Will you say, that men have no right to be in earnest, in defending *bigotry?* I know you do say this; that is, you say what manifestly implies this. But then I am not to be diverted from my argument by such an answer. Who, I ask, has made the decision that Orthodoxy is *bigotry?* "Dr. Channing and his friends affirm it." Granted; but in a land of *liberty*, there is a freedom of thought to be allowed; and by far the greater portion of our community have made up their minds, that there is no bigotry in the sentiments in question. But you, Sir, take for granted the very question in dispute; and taking this for granted, you decide just as though there was no appeal from your tribunal, and consign us over to the ranks of dark designing conspirators against the religious liberties of our country.' —p. 21.

We readily concede, that merely to say that a man is a bigot, even though we say it in perfect sincerity, or merely to embrace principles which we honestly think must lead to bigotry, will not make a man a bigot, nor authorize us to treat him as if he were one. He may still insist on the 'right to be judged by the fairest, the most approved, and the most settled rules, by which character can be tried.' This is no more than justice to the Orthodox, and we confess we cannot see why it should be accounted any more than justice to Unitarians. Who has made the decision that Unitarians have

forfeited all pretensions to the Christian character? 'Professor Stuart and his friends affirm it.' Granted; but in a land of *liberty*, there is a freedom of thought to be allowed; and by far the greater portion of our community are not prepared to set down Unitarians indiscriminately either as Atheists or Deists. Professor Stuart and his friends take for granted the very question in dispute; and taking this for granted, they go on to act just as though there was no appeal from their tribunal, and consign us over to the ranks of the haters of truth, and enemies of God.

Some may still object, that the difficulty has not been fairly met.

'If I believe,' says Professor Stuart, 'that there are unequivocal declarations in God's word (as I truly do), in respect to these tremendous subjects; if I believe that the impenitent are surely exposed to endless misery; that those who reject the Saviour as he is offered in the Gospel, "shall not see life, but that the wrath of God will *abide* on them"; can I, as a man of any pretensions to benevolence, refrain from telling all this to others, from urging it upon them, and from warning them of the danger in which I sincerely believe them to be? Truly, the opponents of our religious views must halt here, and candidly avow, that if such are our real convictions, we ought in all good conscience to urge them upon our neighbours.

'Say, if you please, that we are utterly mistaken; that all our convictions are the result of superstition, or prejudice, or bigotry, or of a narrow, illiberal education; yet so long as we are in this plight, what are we to do? As honest men, we must follow the dictates of our consciences. We acknowledge the possibility that these may be blinded, or perverted, or even "seared"; but so long as we are not convinced that this is the case, how can we do otherwise than propagate our sentiments by all proper methods and with all the earnestness in our power?' — pp. 17, 18.

He cannot be serious, of course, in intimating that Dr. Channing or any other Unitarian, doubts the right of the Orthodox to avail themselves of all 'proper methods' for the propagation of their peculiarities; but what are 'proper methods,' that is the question. Those who talk so much about conscience in this connexion, appear to us to confound conscience with mere opinion. Will it be pretended, that any one has a right to take up a mere opinion, especially on a doubtful and difficult subject, respecting which

the wisest and best men in the community differ, and act on it as if it were an established certainty. We know that we are fallible, and we are bound in conscience to consider this in every thing we do. The evidence, as it strikes our minds at the time, may convince us, that our own opinion is well founded; and this would be sufficient, if we were infallible in all our judgments, to establish it as a principle, on which we might safely and innocently act. But we are not infallible; and hence arises the necessity and obligation of considering how the same evidence strikes other minds; and how our acting on it will affect the paramount claims and rights of others. Because we are bound in all cases to act consistently with our own convictions of right, it does not follow that we are bound in all cases to act consistently with our own convictions of truth or probability; for though convinced, on the whole, that a proposition is true or probable, we may not be convinced of it in such a sense, or on such evidence or authority, as to think it right to assume it as a principle or rule of conduct. Our convictions of right itself, too, (we mean of right in the abstract) will be materially modified, in practice, by our knowledge, that other persons, equally competent as ourselves to form a judgment on the subject, hold different views, and hold them as sincerely and as confidently. We may think it right, abstractly considered, that a person holding certain opinions should be denounced as an apostate from Christianity; but if we find that others, equally competent as ourselves to form a judgment on the subject, have come to different conclusions, we are bound in conscience to hesitate. In such a case the general question of right and duty is as much affected in reality by the convictions of others, as by our own, and ought to be as much affected in the eye of conscience.*

---

* 'The censor Cato, the saint Bernard, and the reformer Calvin were equally insensible to the blandishments of love, the allurements of pleasure, and the vanity of wealth; and so, likewise, were the monsters Marat and Robespierre; but all equally sacrificed every generous and finer feeling of humanity, which none are naturally without, to an abstract principle or opinion; which, by narrowing their understandings, hardened their hearts, and left them under the unrestrained guidance of all the atrocious and sanguinary passions, which party violence could stimulate or excite.

'This will always be the effect of such principles or opinions, whatever they are; whether true or false; whether mild or severe; pro-

Granting, however, for a moment, that Exclusionists cannot consistently nor conscientiously refrain from denouncing Unitarians as incapable of salvation; what then? Do they think to prove that they have not done what Dr. Channing has charged them with doing, by saying that they have done it, and must do it, on principle? Do they cease to be intolerant and persecuting, because they maintain, that they are so for conscience' sake? Will the good people of this Commonwealth look with less distrust and aversion on the measures of a set of men, many of them from other states, who are casting about firebrands, arrows, and death in this community, because they think to justify it by exclaiming, Gentlemen, we love you all; hence our denunciations; we must do so, or we should not be consistent. A writer, who will hardly be suspected of latitudinarianism either in politics or religion, after speaking of the many amiable and excellent

---

vided they are embraced with a degree of eagerness and avidity sufficient to give men confidence in their infallibility, and make them supersede the feelings of nature. To enforce the doctrines of a religion, which prohibits violence and bloodshed in every case, even that of self-defence, more violence has been exercised, more blood shed, and more cruel tortures inflicted, than in any other dispute or quarrel, that ever was engendered by the turbulent and unruly passions of men; and whether the point at issue be a dogma of religion, an axiom of philosophy, or a maxim of politics, its effects will be the same, provided it has sufficient influence to enslave the natural affections of the soul, and induce men to prefer a theorem of the head, to a sentiment of the heart.

'Had Lord Bacon seen such events as have lately happened, he would not have said, that "Atheism did never perturb States"; for if men once unite to maintain systematically that there are many Gods, one God, or no God, the moral effects will be exactly the same; the dogma instantly becomes the rallying point of a sect or faction; and all the selfish, violent, and atrocious passions are collected into its vortex. It is true, that a negative dogma is less likely, than an affirmative one, to engage such passions; because it is less flattering to that opinionative pride and presumption, which is necessary to give them vigor and energy sufficient for any great exertions: but, nevertheless, that it may become the rallying point of a faction, and be a motive for very bloody persecution, we have had abundant proof. If men can once suppose an opinion to be infallibly certain, they will feel an inclination to propagate it; and consequently square their morality to that inclination; which will lead them to employ force, if persuasion do not prevail. Truth, they say, is the foundation of all virtue; and truth is, to every man, that which he himself thinks.' — *Knight's Analytical Inquiry into the Principles of Taste*, pp. 236 — 239.

qualities of Sir Thomas More, goes on to say; 'But the impelling motive for his conduct was, his assent to the tenet, that belief in the doctrines of the Church was essential to salvation. For upon that tenet, whether it is held by Papist or Protestant, toleration becomes, what it has so often been called, soul-murder; persecution is, in the strictest sense, a duty; and it is an act of religious charity to burn heretics alive, for the purpose of deterring others from damnation. The tenet is proved to be false by its intolerable consequences; and no stronger example can be given of its injurious effect on the heart, than that it should have made Sir Thomas More a persecutor.' *

Here we must pause for the present. Appearances threaten a warm and protracted controversy. We did not provoke it; we do not fear it. We have sometimes thought, that this sudden outcry among the Exclusionists, charging Unitarians with abuse, misrepresentation, and intolerance, was to be regarded merely as the finesse of cunning disputants. Feeling themselves peculiarly obnoxious to these same charges, and continually assailed and harassed by them from every quarter, and wholly unable to meet and repel them by argument or evidence, they have at length hit on the expedient of hurling them back on their accusers, without inquiring or much caring whether they can be sustained or not. In this way they may at least hope to divert, for a time, the public attention, and throw dust in the eyes of their own friends, and insinuate every where a general and vague impression, that all this mutual recrimination respecting bigotry and exclusiveness is to be regarded in no other light, than as an unauthorized and discreditable bandying of odious imputations, in which both parties alike are implicated. But it will not do. If it is a mere artifice or temporary expedient, it will come to nought. If it is an attempt to crush, or silence, or check a rising sect by the mere force of numbers and vociferation; the character not only of the Unitarians, but of the Orthodox generally in this State, is a sufficient pledge that it must fail utterly. We ask for no better question, to try the respective claims of the two parties to the public favor, than this,— Whose principles and measures are most conducive to free inquiry, religious liberty, and Christian charity? This is the

* Southey's Book of the Church, Vol. II. pp. 26, 27.

controversy; and considering the spirit and intelligence which are now abroad, and the obvious tendencies of society and the human mind, it is without a shadow of doubt or concern, that we commit its issues to the providence of Him who judgeth righteously.

ART. VII. DR. CODMAN'S *Speech in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, February* 3, 1831. Boston. Pierce & Parker.

FROM a remote but uncertain period, graduates while preparing themselves for the ministry, have resided at Harvard College, that they might enjoy the advantages to be derived from the lectures on Divinity and other subjects, from the library, and from the literary society of the place. Their numbers gradually increased, until, in December 1815, the Corporation with the consent and at the instance of the Board of Overseers, addressed the following circular letter to a large number of the sons and friends of the College, asking their assistance in providing additional means for theological education in Harvard University.

'The Corporation of Harvard College have thought it their duty to adopt measures for increasing the means of Theological Education at the University. In order to enable students in divinity to reap the benefit of the eminent advantages which the College possesses for this purpose, there is need of funds for assisting meritorious students in divinity of limited means to reside at the University for a requisite time; of one or more Professors, whose attention may be exclusively given to this class of students; and of a separate building.

'The Corporation are disposed and determined to apply the resources of the College to this object, as far as other indispensable claims admit. But these resources being entirely inadequate to the accomplishment of their views, they feel it incumbent upon them to call upon the friends of the University, and of the Christian ministry, to coöperate with them in this interesting design.

'As the best method of obtaining the assistance of the liberal and pious, it is proposed to form a society "*for the education of candidates for the ministry in Cambridge University.*" All persons who shall subscribe five dollars a year shall be members,

and continue such so long as they shall pay the said annual sum ; — clergymen paying two dollars a year to be considered as members.

'All persons subscribing one hundred dollars to be considered members of the said Society for life. Subscriptions for smaller sums, either as annual payments or as donations, will be thankfully received.

'Whilst annual and life subscriptions are desired, it is hoped that affluent friends of the College and of the Churches will, by donations and bequests, do justice to the noble object of Christian munificence here presented.

'The Corporation are induced to believe, that a large number of persons in the metropolis and in various parts of this Commonwealth will view this invitation with favor ; as an occasion for doing what many of them have anxiously wished to see accomplished.

'In pursuance of this design, they have requested a large number of the sons and friends of the University to take charge of papers for subscription, and also clergymen to promote the object in their respective congregations. After the first Monday of April next, the Corporation will call a meeting of the subscribers, that they may adopt any measures they may see fit for carrying this charitable plan into effect, and particularly to choose five Trustees to act with the Corporation in the appropriation of the funds. In behalf of the Corporation, with the assent of the Board of Overseers,

'JOHN T. KIRKLAND, *President.*

'*Harvard College, Dec.* 18, 1815.

'Agreeably to public notice by the Corporation of Harvard College, the Subscribers to the Proposals for raising a Fund and forming a Society for increasing the means of Theological Education at the University of Cambridge, met July 17, 1816, at the Boston Athenæum.

'The Rev. President Kirkland was chosen Moderator of the meeting ; and Rev. Charles Lowell, Scribe.

'On motion, the Moderator was requested to open the meeting by prayer.

'It was then voted to form a "Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University."

'A plan of a constitution and rules was then offered by one of the subscribers to the Fund, which having been considered and amended, was adopted.'

According to this constitution, the only power and authority claimed by the Society in regard to the School is thus expressed in the eighth Rule of the second Article.

'It shall be the duty of the Trustees, in conjunction with the President and Fellows of Harvard College (with whom they are for this purpose united, the whole to form one Board, seven of whom shall make a quorum), to attend to the execution of the objects of this Society; especially to appropriate the funds which may be from time to time collected, to assist young men of competent talents, pure morals, and piety, in preparing themselves for the Christian ministry, and to provide for them the best instruction which the funds of the Society will admit; it being understood, that every encouragement be given to the serious, impartial, and unbiased investigation of Christian truth; and that no assent to the peculiarities of any denomination of Christians be required either of the Students or Professors or Instructers. The Professors and Instructers are to be chosen according to the usages of the University.'

The Corporation and Board of Overseers by a formal vote gratefully accepted the proposition of the Society to found a Theological School in the University, and the funds were paid over to the College Treasurer, and solemnly pledged to this object. From this time regular instruction has been given to the theological students by professors or teachers appointed by the Corporation and Overseers, and the Theological School has constituted an integral and essential part of the University. To give greater distinctness and independence to this department, it was thought best in 1819 to institute a regular Theological Faculty, for the regulation and government of which the following rules and statutes were proposed by the Corporation, and approved and confirmed, in the usual manner, by the Board of Overseers.

'I. The Theological Department, or Faculty of Theology of the University, shall comprise the President and four Professors.

'1. The Hollis Professor of Divinity; who shall give instruction to the theological students in positive and controversial divinity, including the evidences and principles of natural religion, the evidences, doctrines, and duties of revealed religion; said Professor performing all the services enjoined by the Statutes of the Hollis Professorship, which he holds.

'2. The Hancock Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages; who shall give instruction in those languages, and in their application to the interpretation of the Scriptures.

'3. A Professor of Sacred Literature, or Expository Theology; who shall treat of the criticism and interpretation of the Scriptures.

'4. A Professor of Pastoral Theology; who shall give instruction in the duties of the pastoral office, and the composition and delivery of sermons; also in ecclesiastical history and polity.

'The Professors in the above branches may in their instruction omit the particular consideration of such subjects in their respective departments, as may be pointed out by the Corporation; said subjects being sufficiently discussed by other professors or instructers in the University.

'II. The Professor in the third department shall be denominated Dexter Professor of Sacred Criticism, and shall receive towards his compensation the increase of the Dexter Fund, granted by the trustees of said fund, and the sum of seven hundred and forty dollars, granted for the purpose by the Society for promoting Theological Education in Harvard University.

'III. The Dexter Professor, and the Professor of Pastoral Theology, when chosen, shall perform such duties in the theological instruction of the University, as may from time to time be assigned by the Corporation, including, with respect to the Dexter Professor, those specified by the trustees of the Society above named, and shall have the privileges and powers pertaining to the Professors of the College generally, as well as make the usual promises and engagements.'

The Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University was reorganized, in 1824, under a new Constitution, part of the eighth article of which ran thus;

'The Directors shall take the general oversight and superintendence of the Institution, and make regulations for the admission, instruction, and discipline of the students; such regulations to be submitted to the Corporation of Harvard College, for their assent, in all cases wherein by the Constitution of the University such assent may be requisite. The Directors shall from time to time examine into the state of the Institution, its moral and religious character, and the progress of the students, and enforce a strict and faithful compliance with all the regulations; and they shall take all measures tending to promote the welfare and success of the Institution, as far as may be done by them without interference with the authority of said Corporation.'

The government of the University, by assenting to this Constitution, conferred new powers on the Directors of the Society, which they held and exercised as its officers or agents. The whole course of the proceedings, however, as well as the language of the Constitution, shows that it was

the intention of all the parties to preserve the legal authority of the Corporation and Overseers unimpaired; and that it was no part of the plan to sever the School in any respect from the University. It was thought that the interests of the College and the School would be promoted in various ways by engaging the services of several gentlemen, not in the Corporation, in its general oversight and superintendence. On trial, however, it was found, that the new arrangement was attended with many practical inconveniences; in consequence of which the Society saw fit, during the last year, with the consent of the Corporation, to resign all the authority in the School which had been delegated to its officers. At the same time it transferred to the Corporation all the power and control it had previously held and exercised over the funds of the institution. The Society, under its present organization, has no connexion whatever, either with the University, or the School, or the funds of the School.

These and other changes required that the existing statutes of the Theological Faculty should be revised and thrown into a new draft. This was accordingly done by the Corporation, and the Statutes in their new form were submitted to the Overseers for their assent, as follows;

'*Chapter* I. *Of the Department in general.*

'1. There shall be three Professors in the Department, *to wit*, the Hollis Professor of Divinity, the Professor of Biblical Literature, and the Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care. The Government of the University reserves the right to give an additional title to the two last named Professors, or to either of them, whenever any donation shall be made for their support, amounting to one half of the sum required for their annual salaries, or when it shall be thought proper for any other reason.

'2. The President of the University, and the three Professors above mentioned, with such other Professors or Officers as the Corporation may from time to time designate, shall constitute the Theological Faculty of the University.

'3. The Theological Faculty shall have power, and it shall be their duty, to make regulations respecting the studies, and for promoting industry, order, good morals, and piety among the students: Provided the same be not repugnant to the constitution and laws of the University, nor to the Statutes of this Department; and all such regulations shall be forthwith laid before the Corporation, and shall be in force until repealed by them.

'4. The Faculty shall also oversee and administer the interior government of the School, and the discipline of the students. And for this purpose one of the Professors shall be appointed by the Corporation to be Dean of the Faculty, whose duty it shall be to enforce the due observance and execution of all the statutes and regulations of the Department, to call meetings of the Faculty, and to keep a record of their votes and proceedings; and as the representative and organ of the Faculty, to communicate with the Government of the University, and also with others when occasion shall require it, on all subjects relating to the School, or to the Department.

'5. The Theological Professors, with any others whom the Corporation shall from time to time appoint to that duty, shall perform divine service in the chapel of the University on the Lord's day throughout the year. The public weekly lecture on divinity required of the Hollis Professor by the Statutes of his Professorship, shall be delivered as heretofore in the chapel on the Lord's day, and constitute part of the religious services, until otherwise ordered by the Corporation; and so long as those lectures shall be so delivered, the Hollis Professor shall perform one half of the divine service in the chapel on the Lord's day. The other half of all the said services shall be performed by the other two Professors.

'6. The daily prayers in the chapel of the University, and also those in the chapel of Divinity Hall, shall be attended by the Theological Professors; the respective services being performed by each of them alternately, or otherwise divided between them, as shall be from time to time prescribed by the Corporation: Provided, that the services in Divinity Hall may be performed by any of the Theological Students, under the superintendence of a Professor, when the Theological Faculty shall think fit so to order. Each one of the Professors will consider it his duty, by all the means in his power, to cultivate in the students the spirit of personal religion, and of their profession.

'7. The Professors shall be elected by the President and Fellows, with the consent and approbation of the Overseers; and they may be removed by the same authority, for any just and sufficient cause.

'8. It shall be in the power of the Corporation, with the assent of the Overseers, to make any alterations and amendments in the Statutes of the Department, which may from experience be found useful, so as the same be not repugnant to the foundations of the respective Professorships.

'*Chapter* II. *Of the Hollis Professorship of Divinity.*

[After reciting the twelve original Statutes of Mr. Hollis's foundation, which were inserted in our Review of that gentle-

man's life and benefactions, and are not affected by the new arrangement, the Statutes of the Theological Faculty proceed.]

'13. Inasmuch as the fund given by Mr. Hollis furnishes less than one tenth part of the salary of the Professor, and the remainder thereof is paid by the University from other sources, it is considered to be no violation of the sixth article above written, to require of the person holding the office of Hollis Professor of Divinity, so long as he shall receive a full Professor's salary, some other services not inconsistent with those prescribed as above, by the founder of this Professorship, and not repugnant to his Statutes; the Professor elect assenting thereto at the time of accepting his appointment. It is accordingly further enacted, that, —

'The person holding the office of Hollis Professor of Divinity shall perform all the duties above prescribed and assigned to him in the first chapter of these Statutes.

'14. He shall also give instruction to the Theological Students in Natural Religion, Ethics, and the Evidences of Revealed Religion; also in Ecclesiastical History, and in Dogmatic Theology. The duties prescribed in this article, so far as they are embraced in the foregoing original Statutes of the founder, are not to be considered as requiring additional courses of lectures, but only as prescribing the mode in which the instruction provided for in the original Statutes shall be given.

'*Chapter* III. *Of the Professor of Biblical Literature.*

'1. The Professor of Biblical Literature shall give instruction in the interpretation of the Old and New Testament, and in the collateral branches of Sacred Literature, which may tend to promote a critical knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

'2. His duties will embrace a course of instruction on the interpretation of the New Testament, to be given to each of the three classes of Theological Students, and like courses on the interpretation of the Old Testament, to the Middle and the Senior Classes.

'3. If the Government should think fit at any time so to order, this Professor shall give instruction in the Hebrew language, which will make up two complete courses of instruction to be given by him throughout the three years.

'*Chapter* IV. *Of the Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care.*

'1. The Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care shall give instruction in the art of preaching, or the composition and delivery of sermons; and also on the duties of the Pastoral Office.

'2. His instructions will be given in written lectures, so far

as the subjects may require or admit that mode of communication; and also in frequent personal intercourse with the students, either separately, or in classes, or in familiar lectures on the public and private duties of their profession, together with such private advice, expostulation, reproof, and encouragement, as may tend to the cultivation and improvement of their personal and professional characters.

'3. The Government will hereafter make such further and more particular regulations respecting the duties of the Professor, as experience shall show to be necessary and expedient.'

These Statutes were referred by the Board of Overseers to a Committee, as usual, who reported in favor of assenting thereto, and this report was accepted February 3, 1831, by a vote of thirty-four to twelve. It was on a previous motion to recommit the whole subject to the same Committee, with instructions to report at the next stated meeting of the Board, that the Rev. Dr. Codman of Dorchester made a speech against the adoption of the Statutes, a printed copy of which is now before us.

From these historical notices it will appear, that every thing which has been done respecting the Theological School has been done openly and with deliberation, by the authority of the Corporation, and with the consent of the Board of Overseers. It will also be seen, that Dr. Codman entirely mistook the real question before the Board of Overseers, if he supposed that it was, whether a Theological School should be instituted in the University, or whether that School should have a regular Theological Faculty, or whether that Faculty should have its Statutes. The question, and the only question, properly before the Board was, whether the Statutes of 1819 *should continue in force*, or be superseded by those of 1831, as being better in themselves, or better adapted to the present condition and circumstances of the School. At the same time we have no wish to evade the general question, whether it was right or expedient in the Corporation and Overseers to establish a Theological School in the University, in the first instance. A full, and, in our view, perfectly satisfactory article on this point, and in reply to Dr. Codman, has been prepared, but the present Number was so far printed off before it was received, as to make it necessary to defer it to the next.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

N°. XLIV.

NEW SERIES — N°. XIV.

MAY, 1831.

ART. I. — DR. CODMAN'S *Speech in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, February* 3, 1831. Boston. Peirce & Parker.

IN our last Number we adverted to the History of the establishment of the Theological School at Cambridge, and presented to our readers the several Statutes which have been prepared for its government. We now come to the examination of Dr. Codman's Speech. The printing of this speech we consider in the nature of an appeal to the public, from the decision of the Board, an intended, premeditated appeal. Indeed we presume the chief object of making the speech was to give some show of weight and authority to its doctrines, when laid before the public, beyond what they would ordinarily receive, if they had made their first appearance in a newspaper or review. The learned gentleman admits, in the course of it, that he had no hope of 'arresting the establishment of a theological faculty in this University'; and as the professed object, of delaying the measure or of modifying it, failed by a very large vote, the only point to be gained by the publication of the speech, is to inflame and aggravate that spirit of hostility, which it has suited some prominent individuals among us to excite toward this ancient institution.

But Dr. Codman is not exactly the man to be the leader of a party warfare of this kind. He has too many con-

nexions among the friends of the liberal system to entertain all those prejudices and animosities, which are necessary ingredients in the character of a proselyting sectarian. He knows too intimately and entirely the kind and amiable feelings, the intellectual worth, the pure and correct morality, that are to be found in the ranks of his opponents, to apply to them the fierce and denunciatory epithets, with which a more persecuting temper has not unfrequently assailed them. He has travelled abroad and at home, and become too familiar with mankind not to despise that illiberal and contracted temper, which limits all truth and integrity and Christian principle within the narrow circle of believers in one theological creed. We fear, however, that as the good Doctor seems to admit that sectarians can be Christians, and speaks of his consideration and regard towards them, and more especially, as he declares that he should be 'the last person in the world to wish to deprive them of their right, or *lessen their facilities*, of propagating what they honestly believe to be the doctrines of Christianity,' he has opened an account, which it will not be very easy to settle, with the modern Inquisition to which he is amenable.

But, these disqualifications notwithstanding, Dr. Codman has some claims on his theological friends. He has presented their views as strongly and forcibly as they could be exhibited, and he has set forth their arguments clearly, with energy, and apparent self-conviction; and his arrows, if they come short of the mark, fail not from the feebleness of the arm, but the weakness of the bow.

The Doctor well understands the advantage of stating the question in his own way, and accordingly he demands 'whether, in the existing state of public opinion on religious subjects in this Commonwealth, it is expedient for this University to descend from the high and elevated station, which it ought to hold as the University of the State, and by the establishment of a Theological Department, lend its mighty influence to the support of any one sect of professing Christians?' And he seems to take for granted, if he can establish the negative of this question, that he maintains his case.

The true question before the Overseers was, whether the Statutes for the Theological School, then proposed by the Corporation, should be substituted for those of 1819, which were

already in force, and would have continued in force if the new Statutes had not been adopted. We are willing, however, in this discussion, to yield to Dr. Codman a proposition for which in the course of his speech he contends, namely, that the original establishment of such a department is not a conclusive reason for continuing it, or for sanctioning and endeavouring to improve it, if its original establishment was wrong in principle, or is found to have injurious effects. We give up, too, the argument to be derived from the disadvantage of abrogating existing establishments, because we are willing to meet the case on the broadest ground of principle, and would not justify a continuance in error on the authority of usage, if such usage can be proved to be wrong.

A theological department, then, we contend, is an indispensable part of this University; and we do not mean to argue from the example of every other such institution, with the only exceptions, as far as we know, of London and Virginia, but from the origin, design, and object of Harvard College itself.

This Institution was, and is, dedicated *Christo et Ecclesiæ.* Its pious founders erected, supported, and maintained it, chiefly because a good education was necessary for the existence of a learned ministry, and a learned ministry was one of the chief means, by the blessing of Heaven, for the propagation and maintenance of the Christian religion. It was not for the purpose of making physicians or lawyers or statesmen, that classical literature and the exact sciences were to be taught in Harvard College. These great objects were only incidental to the greater and more important one of bringing on a regular and abundant supply of able, intelligent, and pious ministers for the churches of Christ.

In 1642 one of the first patrons of the College thus writes; 'After God had carried us safe to New England, and we had builded our houses, provided necessaries for livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and settled the civil government, one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity, dreading to leave an *illiterate ministry to the churches*, when our present ministers should lie in dust.' *

* New England's First Fruits. Mass. Hist. Coll. Vol. I. p. 202.

Theological instruction was thus distinctly pointed out as the ultimate design of Harvard College; but there were preliminary measures to be taken before this instruction could be bestowed. Youth were to be educated in other knowledge as a prerequisite to the study of Divinity. It was as necessary that students should become acquainted with the principles of language and the philosophy of the age, before they pursued the study of their appropriate profession, as that they should be able to read and write, before they began the study of the classics; and the College was founded to give them that instruction, which should prepare them for acquiring a knowledge of theology, and when its means would permit, give them the knowledge of theology itself. By the more liberal donations of modern times, a wider sphere of utility has been opened to the College, and statesmen and civilians and distinguished men of every department of life have obtained the first elements of their intellectual wealth within its walls; but from the laying of its first corner-stone, the preparation of pupils to occupy the sacred desk has been one of its steadiest designs; and all its arrangements of study and discipline have been so intimately connected with this object, that they cannot now be changed without a radical alteration and renovation of the entire establishment. From the earliest time, morning and evening prayers have been daily offered in the chapel, at which all the students have been required to attend. Sabbath exercises have been regularly performed for many years in the College chapel, and so long certainly as the Hollis professorship of Divinity has been founded, constant and regular instruction has been given to some extent in theology.* A department, then, in which professional education shall be completed, is only an extension of the original design, not the intrusion of a new branch of study. It is carrying on and completing, what, having been begun before, had always been extended to the limits of the means that the College possessed. It is

* It may be mentioned, as an illustration of the perfectly catholic spirit in which the government of the University is administered, that students of other denominations are not required to attend worship in the chapel on Sundays; and as the doctrinal and controversial lectures required of the Hollis Professor are delivered on that occasion, it is not necessary that an undergraduate should be directly exposed in any way whatever to the theological instructions of the School or College.

doing for the students of theology what had been done for students in medicine and law, enabling them, in the atmosphere of a college, with the habits, manners, and means that a great public seminary only can supply, with the aid of books that are not elsewhere easy of access, and with the intercourse of learned and intellectual companions, and associates of more advanced age, to prosecute their researches and employ their time, like pupils of other professions, with economy and convenience.

But independently of the ancient design of Harvard College, we hold that they who have the care of it, were bound by all the moral obligations of their place to establish a theological department as speedily as the means of so doing were at their command.

A College is, *ex vi termini*, a place of public education. It is maintained for the purpose of enabling those, who resort to it, to act well their part on the great theatre of life. And what is their part but to be useful to the community in some honest and honorable profession or employment? Of all the various occupations of society, they who are favored with a liberal education most usually devote themselves to professional employment. Now why should not all these have equal claims to the benefits of college instruction? Why should a physician or lawyer be educated for the actual entrance on his professional duties, and a theologian, half instructed, be sent off to get the residue of his instruction where he may? We are no converts to the doctrine, that any profession is in itself sacred. A clergyman is an instructer, and only an instructer, of his fellow men; a teacher, on a larger scale, but a teacher, as strictly and absolutely as a schoolmaster, and neither more nor less. He is a man separated to teach what it becomes all men carefully and earnestly to learn, but separated from them not by any sanctity of character, or supposed sacredness of duty, but that he may himself the better learn, and thereby be the better enabled to teach. He performs his pastoral functions on the common principle of the economy and advantage of a division of labor; because it is better for the whole, that one should exclusively attend to the cultivation of his own understanding, and the communication of his acquirements to others, than that, by a common and indiscriminate claim upon all, the duty should be poorly performed, or perhaps wholly

omitted. To prepare an individual for entering on this task, is part of the duty of a college of universal instruction; and we see no reason, except in the antiquated notion of the divine right of bishops, which has fallen into the same contempt as the divine right of kings, why this part of instruction should not be provided wherever it conveniently may.

Dr. Codman and his Orthodox friends admit the necessity of human learning for an accomplished and useful minister of the gospel; but their objection is, that the candidate must not acquire his learning at Harvard College. Now we beg leave to doubt the accuracy of the terms in which this objection is conveyed. We suspect the true ground of hostility is not to the *place*, but the doctrine; not that young men should not learn theology at Harvard College, but that such theology as they do learn there, should be learned nowhere. To this objection, properly stated, we will give our answer; but we appeal to the candor of Dr. Codman to publish the true reason, in the next edition of his Speech, and then it will be found that there is not in his mind, or the minds of his friends, any objection to a theological department in Harvard College, provided a reverend friend of his might be Dean of the Faculty. Even the hierarchal appellation of Dean might then be tolerated, and its *authority* certainly would be in hands that would not hesitate in its use. Until the inauguration of the present Hollis Professor of Divinity, we never heard a suggestion, that Theology should not be taught at Harvard College; and the cry since has been, not that the professorship should be abolished, but that somebody should be appointed to teach such theological doctrines as are congenial to the minds of Dr. Codman and his Calvinistic associates.

We have on no occasion found any unwillingness in these gentlemen to have the professor's chair remain; indeed its influence and authority seem to be constantly coveted. Argument has been exhausted to show that they have a right to it; and when what is urged for argument is exhausted, bitter revilings and severe censure, with no measured imputations of dishonesty and fraud, are heaped on the College government for retaining a professor who fills his place certainly to the great acceptance of those who appointed him. If these gentlemen had their way, Dr. Codman, or some other disciple of Calvin, would be introduced there, and why? To teach his own dogmas; to propagate

his own faith; to spread the gloomy, abasing, distressing, and mystical doctrines of an unintelligible creed; to introduce that doxology, which Dr. Codman complains is at present omitted; and which, if it was not used by sincere and pious men, would seem to Unitarian ears very like blasphemy and polytheism.

All this has been done of old time, and would be done again, under Dr. Codman's scheme, if the power over the College should ever pass into his hands. The objection, therefore, is not sound or sincere, that there should not be any religious instruction at Harvard College. If there may be any, the quantity of it cannot be quarrelled with. The education that it is worth while to give at all, it is worth while to make as complete as possible. What it would be right for one professor of divinity to do, it cannot be wrong to have done more extensively by two or three; and the principles, which may be properly inculcated on the younger pupils, the older may without blame examine, and, as they think proper, confirm or reject. A theological department is obviously only an extension of the same instruction, which the College originally was designed to promote; an enlargement of what it has always given; a continuation, on a broader scale, of what has been done there by the professors of Dr. Codman's creed, before what we consider the errors of that creed were discovered and exposed.

We hold it to be unfair to profess that the establishment of a theological department in Harvard College is a measure to be denounced in itself, when the real objection is not to an establishment as such, but only to that kind of establishment, of which Dr. Codman and his friends describe this one to be. It is fighting under false colors, and enlisting recruits, who would not march to the battle, if they knew the nature of the service.

Dr. Codman is too wise to trust his reputation as an intelligent and honest man to this mode of warfare. The new department will teach Unitarianism! It is a Unitarian institution! The mighty influence of the College will support one — that is, the Unitarian — sect of Christians! This is the true cause of complaint; and to support it, the Doctor occupies some time in establishing the fact, that none of the professors is of the Calvinistic faith.

There are some citizens in our community, who think any

form of Christianity better than none; and would prefer its most erroneous doctrines, rather than that the young and tender mind should be wholly without the influence of its precepts. In their opinion, truth would shine through error, and its intrinsic warmth dry up or scatter the clouds that surround it. Not so Dr. Codman and his Orthodox friends. Carry out his argument, and there must be no religious instruction, and no religious services for the pupils in the College. Either something will be said contrary to his doctrines, or something will be omitted to be said, which his doctrines imply or require; and to prevent that, it is best to have nothing to do with religion at all. In other words, Christianity is only good when it assumes our forms and opinions. If you are not a Calvinist, it is immaterial what you are. One error is no worse than another; and you may as well be an infidel, as a Unitarian. Where such habits of thinking prevail, there is no wonder that such hostility is manifest.

Now we do not deny, that the Professors of the School are Unitarians; and we rejoice in the fact. We do not deny, that the probability is, that the students will come from the School impressed with the truth of the Unitarian faith. God forbid that it should be otherwise. It is the object of all study to acquire and advance truth; and as, in our opinion, this system is the truth, and the only truth, we ask the benediction of Heaven upon all the means by which it is promoted.

But, with this admission, we deny that in any sense the School can be called a Unitarian school, or that the establishment of it is with design or with tendency to promote Unitarianism, except exactly so far as Unitarianism is proved to be the true gospel of Jesus Christ. In this respect the theological department at Cambridge differs from the establishments at Andover, Newton, Wilbraham, or any other sectarian school in this or any other country in Christendom.

In the School at Cambridge, no creed of any sect is required of teachers or pupils beyond the acknowledgment, that the Bible is the record of the word of God. Men are eligible as Professors, whatever may be the peculiarities of their opinion; and the pupils are free to examine and decide for themselves, as to the tenets they shall receive and admit as true. There is no test for admission, and no penalty of the nature of exclusion for differences of opinion. The

abstract truths of Christianity, so far as by the nature of the Christian system its doctrines can be taught in abstract form, are here to be inculcated and explained; and if by the power of the human mind, and the character of our religion, it can be inculcated and received as pure elementary truth, so it will be inculcated, and so it will be received.

But we will not avoid the force of Dr. Codman's argument. Although any Christian is eligible as a professor, he contends that none but a Unitarian will be elected; although truth in the abstract may be taught, the pupils will be, or become, Unitarian. This is what he would illustrate in his remarks, though the learned speaker avoids the declaration in form.

To this objection then we say, that if theology is to be taught at all, if the first principles of religion are to be conveyed to the mind, if prayers are to be publicly offered every day, and sermons preached on Sunday, these services must be performed by men having some particular creed, and belonging to some one or more of the religious parties into which the people of the Commonwealth are divided. The objection, therefore, either avails for the total abrogation of all religious instruction, or is good for nothing. And it avails more as an argument to abolish the religious instruction given to the younger pupils, than to professional students. In that tender age, faith is commonly established rather by authority than conviction. The youthful mind receives implicitly what it is taught, and especially so receives that instruction, which is given independently of any personal research. Professional students may be more guarded; they seek for a reason for the doctrines advanced, and examine for themselves whether these things be so.

As to the other branch of the objection, that none but Unitarians will be elected, its truth, and of course its force, must depend on the character of the government of the College. If the government was tied up by statutes, or limited grants, so that it was not free to act according to its own judgment, on full views of what constituted the public good, there would be weight in the objection. But such is not the case. Nothing prevents the Corporation from proposing a Calvinist. Nothing hinders the Overseers from rejecting a Unitarian. Individual members in the latter body act on this liberty, and Dr. Codman or some of his friends recently

cast their ballots in opposition to the Professor of Biblical Literature, a gentleman of extraordinary learning and eminent purity of character, against whom the whole world could find nothing, but his Unitarianism, as a matter for complaint.

But they are not a majority, and can effect nothing! What then? The path is open to every body; the roads are all free. The election in this, as in every other exercise of popular will, must be determined by the voice of the majority. But our Calvinistic brethren are not that majority, and therefore they complain. They may, however, become a majority. When the senators and councillors of the Commonwealth are Orthodox, then Harvard College will be under Orthodox authority. If their doctrines are spreading, as they profess to believe, and liberal opinions are falling into disrepute, as they industriously inculcate in their publications, the sceptre, that has departed from Judah, will return again, and a new day of darkness succeed to the period of departing light. We do not believe this time will come very soon. We offer them no consolation in the deceptive prospect of such an improbable change; but we maintain that an institution, which is bound to no creed or form by positive enactment, an institution, that may be directed to any system, and made the advocate of any theological sect that the majority of the people please to command, has all the characteristics of the freest, fairest, most catholic and liberal establishment, and cannot fairly be charged with any sectarian influence beyond that which the people of the Commonwealth wish to maintain. It is not so at Andover. If the whole community advance, as we hope they will, in knowledge and learning and the clearer and brighter vision of the gospel of salvation, that institution will stand, a cold and dark memorial of the condition of the human mind when it was founded. If we are rightly instructed in the statutes of the professorships there, it would be dangerous for the instructers to grow wiser or know more in all future time, than the grave and reverend seigniors knew, whose original liberality built up that nursery of Calvinism. Formal creeds chain them to their original faith. They are bound in fetters of ice to the dreary coast where first they landed, and no earthly power can ever change their situation. In the progress of intellectual expansion, in the growth of intelligence, in the brighter and warmer day of theological and religious opinion, they can neither advance nor improve.

Already the limit of their faculties is marked out, and they must remain, like some solitary spot in the wilderness, distinguished by its original sterility, while all around is beaming with civilization and culture, and the blessings of industry and the arts of peace.

Much as we prize those doctrines which have been supported in our pages, we are far from believing that they contain all that is yet to be learned on the great topics of the Christian faith. The human mind is destined to go on from improvement to improvement, to advance in a knowledge of its own high nature and condition, and in the developement and illustration of those grander and purer motives, which constitute the religious character of mankind. How, or by what means, we can no more now know, than they did, who died before Protestantism was disclosed, or the Puritan faith gathered its friends upon our shores. But whenever, or however, this may be, the theology taught at Cambridge will proceed with the march of the human mind; advancing as that advances, rejecting its errors, seizing on new truths, and glorifying the divine Source of all human knowledge and religious feeling for each ray of intelligence that is scattered in its path.

The school at Andover and the school at Newton are admitted by Dr. Codman to be sectarian schools. The former teaches the doctrines held for truth by the Orthodox Congregationalists at the time when the creed was formed, which is propounded to its professors. It can teach nothing else. The latter teaches the faith of the Baptists, and must continue to teach that faith through all time. They could not exchange duties, or unite them, however much one or the other sect may prevail. The school at Cambridge professes to teach the truths of the Bible as they are now understood, or *hereafter may be understood*, by those to whom the duty of giving instruction is confided. And the instruction will be confided to those whom the general voice of the community indicates to be worthy of giving that instruction. As knowledge advances, instruction will advance. If, in the progress of time, Baptists or Calvinists are proved to be preëminently right, and the diffusion of intelligence and a better understanding of the Bible give demonstration of their correctness, there is nothing to prevent the Cambridge School from following their faith. If, on the other hand, time and industry,

study and research, human effort and divine aid, encourage and maintain the Unitarian doctrines, or open the mind to higher and nobler and more glorious views of duty and virtue and religious obligation, then will this school have the means of advancing with advancing science, and, bound only to truth, will be found her associate and companion, how bold soever may be the flight she may venture to sustain.

But we pass to another argument urged by Dr. Codman in a manner, which induces us to suppose he considers it the great battering-ram of his attack.

Theological schools, it is admitted, are useful. Even Unitarians may be allowed to have them, if they please. Colleges too may have a distinctive religious character. Amherst or New Haven are too sacred to be touched in this regard; but there must be no theological department at Harvard College, because Harvard College is the child of the State!

There seems to us to be a peculiar infelicity in the reverend gentleman's statement of the facts on which his position depends, and a little error of logic in drawing the conclusion even from the facts he assumes. Let us ascertain how far Harvard College is 'intimately and inseparably connected with the State.'

The College was founded in 1636. The Colony gave two hundred pounds, payable that year, and two hundred the next, and John Harvard, who died in 1638, 'gave the half of his estate (which amounted to seven hundred pounds) for the erecting of the College.' In 1650 the General Court, on the application of the President, passed an act constituting certain persons a Corporation, by the name of the President and Fellows of Harvard College, with perpetual succession; and the whole property held or intended for the College was assigned to and vested in that Corporation, who have maintained a regular succession to this day. From that time to the present, as the advancement of public education required, and because the promotion of education was interesting, and indeed essential to the preservation of a republican government, various sums have been granted by the State to this Corporation for the use of the College; and the Legislature have consented, that the high officers of state should become, with others, a Board of Overseers for the government, in certain respects, of its corporate affairs.

1st. The State, then, or the Colony to which the State is successor, founded the College.

2dly. The State gave divers sums of money to advance its interests.

3dly. The State permits its own officers, *ex officio*, to aid with others in managing the College concerns.

Now we are much in error if any or all these circumstances form such a relationship between the State and the College, that it becomes improper for this College to do what Amherst or New Haven or any other college might be justified in doing.

As founder, the State had unquestionably the sole power and authority over the Institution; might appoint its officers, direct its course of instruction, and hold all its funds in trust for the purposes intended. But this claim of right the State voluntarily gave away, and constituted a Corporation of private citizens, clergymen and laymen, on whom they devolved this duty. And from that day to this the State, in its political capacity, has never exercised, or claimed to exercise, any of the common law rights of the founder of an eleemosynary institution, in regard to the College.

The State has, at various times, been a liberal benefactor to the College. But it *gave* its benefactions, and did not expect to purchase or receive any rights in return. It did not buy or bribe the College Corporation. Whether, on the whole, the public treasury or individual generosity has supplied the larger part of the funds, now or at any time held by the College, we have no means of easy access for determining. Nor is it material, because it is plain, that the most liberal individual would obtain no right by his most splendid donation to interfere with the College government, nor could the State gain any such right by similar generosity.

A standing law formerly gave every incorporated academy a claim on the bounty of the State. Brunswick and Williamstown Colleges have also participated largely in the public munificence, but without any claim by the State, or any apprehension on the part of the Trustees of Academies or the Overseers of those Colleges, that the State had thereby formed an inseparable and intimate union with them.

The individual members of the Senate and Council, and the first and second magistrates of the Commonwealth unite with thirty other persons to form the Board of Overseers. This

gives a peculiarity to the College; but, we apprehend, was intended for the honor of the College, and not for the dignity of the State. These gentlemen are overseers *ex officio;* not while they are acting in the course of their official duty, but apart from it. The designation is merely *descriptio personarum,* and was undoubtedly intended to acquire, for the advancement of education and sound learning, the protection and patronage of eminent and influential men. It is to be remembered, that, in the Board of Overseers, the Governor is not acting in his executive capacity, nor the Senators as a branch of the Legislature, but as private individuals, consulting with other fellow citizens for the welfare of a Corporation, whose prosperity should be dear to every citizen of the Commonwealth.

The further fact, that the Constitution of the Commonwealth has a chapter regarding 'the University at Cambridge and encouragement of literature,' &c. is sometimes urged on the inconsiderate as proof that 'the College is the child of the State.' Dr. Codman indeed has not adverted to this fact. He understood the subject too well himself, and spoke to those whom he knew to be too well acquainted with it, to hazard his character by so sophistical an argument; but, as it will probably be urged in other quarters, it may not be amiss to give it a passing word.

An inspection of the Constitution shows clearly, that the object was to provide for the continuance, perpetuity, and security of the College Corporation; to confirm the President and Fellows in their corporate rights, and to preserve to them and their successors full title and exclusive power over the funds then in their possession, for the purposes for which they were bestowed. It is an absolute, unconditional, confirmatory surrender of all rights which the people of the Commonwealth, or the new government then to be established, had, or might have, as founders of this Corporation, or legal successors to the original founders, and a transfer of any right, or claim of right, from the government and people to the Corporation, who were thereby solemnly recognised as having been before established.

The language of the Constitution is as plain as it is positive. 'It is declared, that the President and Fellows of Harvard College in their corporate capacity, and their successors in that capacity, their officers and servants, shall

have, hold, use, exercise, and enjoy all the powers, authorities, rights, liberties, privileges, immunities, and franchises, which they now have, or are entitled to have, hold, use, exercise, and enjoy, and the same are hereby ratified and confirmed unto them the said President and Fellows of Harvard College, and to their officers and servants respectively for ever.'

The second section confirms their title to all grants, legacies, and devises; and the third provides for ascertaining the successors of the Board of Overseers. Some provision of this kind was made necessary, in that early period of our political history, by the change of government. Any corporation was then a strange thing in this country; and its rights or continuance on the change of government were not exactly understood. *E majori cautelâ* this great Corporation was not exposed to controversy, or trusted to judicial construction. Its rights were protected, and the State again abandoned any supposed power which, by escheat or otherwise, the political revolution of the country might in any way enable it to assume.

The same chapter of the Constitution further provides, 'that nothing therein shall be construed to prevent the Legislature of this Commonwealth from making such alterations in the government of the said University as shall be conducive to its advantage, and the interest of the republic of letters, in as full a manner as might have been done by the Legislature of the late Province of Massachusetts Bay.'

This clause is sometimes impressed to give countenance to Dr. Codman's theory, by other advocates, with an entire misapprehension of its meaning.

At most it amounts only to that reservation, which the State now constantly makes in all incorporations for holding real estate, and for any new object not tested by experience; it is a power to alter and amend for the security of the public, but not to seize upon and possess for the emolument of the State. It purports indeed to be no other reservation of power, than what the Legislature of the Province had. And what power had that Legislature? Originally the common law power or patronage of a Founder, and that had been parted with and transferred. The Legislature of the Province therefore had no lawful control, and the Commonwealth, as its successors, could gain none. But it became necessary,

in the change of government from a colony to an independent sovereignty, to ascertain who, in the new government, were successors to those who acted as Overseers of the College under the royal charter. This is done by the Constitution, and is all that is done by that instrument. The case of *The Trustees of Dartmouth College* vs. *Woodward*, in the Supreme Court of the United States,* abundantly establishes the perfect independence of literary or charitable corporations of any claim on the part of a State; and if that decision is law, and merits the encomium paid to it through the country, it follows that a College corporation is as much unconnected with and independent of the Commonwealth, as a corporation for a bank, an insurance office, a bridge, or a turnpike road.

For the continuance and protection given to the cause of learning and science, the people of the Commonwealth have great merit; and we are the last to undervalue the benefit, or to deny the obligation of gratitude which it imposes. But all that is a very different thing from a disposition to identify the College with the political government of the State, or to encourage an idea that the acts of the Academic Board are the acts of the constituted authorities of the State. And we cannot conceal our opinion, that to propagate such sentiments is an attempt to operate on the College by unfair means, and is a disingenuous mode of promoting sectarian projects under a guise that may deceive some not so well informed as those who wear it.

But let us concede, for argument's sake, that Harvard College is, what Dr. Codman insists that it is, the University of the State. What then? According to his notion, there must not be any theological faculty connected with it, because such faculty would be sectarian; and he asks, if we are prepared 'to violate the Constitution, which expressly provides, that no subordination of any one sect or denomination of Christians to another shall be established by law.' The Doctor in his printed Speech has marked this passage in italics, as if it was peculiarly pungent, and has elsewhere given currency to the idle suggestion of an intention to unite Church and State, — 'I am conscientiously opposed to a union of Church and State'; and he has

* 4 Wheaton's Reports, 518.

attempted to alarm his readers with the stale story of an established religion. 'There can be no objection to their [Law and Medicine] connexion with the University; but not so with Theology, unless it is intended, which may God forbid, to have an established religion.' We have too much respect for Dr. Codman's understanding to suppose he believes such nonsense; and yet we are unwilling to imagine, that these catch words were sounded for the popular ear;

'spargere voces
In vulgum ambiguas.'

A union of Church and State is to be effected only by that subordination of one sect to another, which Dr. Codman and his friends know very well does not exist, cannot exist, and, as far as the liberal party extends, is not desired by any individual. Perfect freedom of inquiry, the right of private judgment, and the sufficiency of instructed reason to ascertain the truth, he and they know to be leading articles of our theology, and to be totally and irreconcilably hostile to all and every power but that of argument, fairly, patiently, and freely presented to the mind. A claim to authority over conscience belongs to another class of the Christian community. Where a desire to possess such authority is exhibited, the Doctor can find nearer home. Let him seek for it in the rigorous exaction of creeds, in permanent provisions for teaching the peculiar opinions of the donors of certain ample funds, that are intended to purchase a control over the faculties of man, and prevent the possibility of their expansion. Let him look for it in trust deeds, that are to fetter the rights of proprietors in the property they contribute for the support of Christian worship, and put the consciences of hearers under the guardianship of a self-constituted hierarchy. Let him find it in consociations and councils and presbyteries; but never look for it or expect to find it in the open, plain path of Unitarianism, which breathes only in the air of freedom, and derives all its present vigor, and all its prospects for the future, from the influence of its evidence and its arguments on the enlightened, increasing, and cultivated reason of those to whom it is addressed.

If the College, with more than its present ample means, was solely and exclusively devoted to the propagation of any religious opinion, there would not, even in such a case, be any

union of Church and State, nor any subordination of any one religious sect to another. This union and this subordination could exist only by force of some law of the land, that should take away the rights of one sect, and give them to others. Such a law, if it passed the forms of legislation, would be unconstitutional and void; but the odium and disgrace of such a law may be fixed on any party who seriously proposes it. And who does? Certainly not the Faculty of Harvard College; not its Corporation or Board of Overseers. Nor do we believe the Orthodox Congregationalists would dare to do it. But the language of their conduct, and the consequences of their positions, if acted out to their full length, would, on their own principles, bring it about.

The College, they say, is the child of the State, therefore the religion taught at the College is the religion of the State; and the State religion is of necessity to bring other sects into subordination! *Heu miserande!* The Orthodox dogmas were taught there for a century; and the outcry is now, that these same dogmas are taught no longer. The doctrines of a 'Calvinistic Baptist of precious memory' were expounded and taught as the religion of the College, when the College was as much as now the child of the State; and it was not discovered during all that time, that there was any violation of republican policy, or any union of Church and State. If the desire now is to regain the Professor's chair for some similar theologian, are we to infer that the possession is coveted for the purpose of putting other sects in subordination, and maintaining supremacy by the power of the State? If the Orthodox party disavow such intentions, let them have the charity to believe, that the friends of the College are equally blameless in this regard.

The professors of religion, as of science, in any College, will of necessity partake of the character of the individuals by whom they are appointed. These individuals in Harvard College are at present the seven members of the Corporation, with whose discretion and official duty the government of the State have no more to do, than they have with the directors of any bank or insurance office incorporated by its authority. For gross mismanagement, no doubt any corporate powers may be vacated; but while the Corporation continues, the individual members must discharge their duties by the light of their own consoience in reference to the

solemn responsibility that is imposed on them. The vote of the Overseers, on a question of concurrence, depends on the same principles; and Dr. Codman and his friends invariably give their vote with the same freedom that they would if they were a majority of the Board. If they cannot conscientiously vote for a Unitarian, why should they suppose Unitarians can conscientiously vote for Calvinists; or if conscience permitted, and expediency only was concerned, how can they expect, that, in any department of the College, men should be appointed to give instruction, whose instructions they who appoint them believe would be erroneous. There is nothing peculiar in this respect in the theological department. The same course of conduct is observed in regard to every professorship or proctorate at Cambridge or Andover. The appointing power nominates the individual, who, in the opinion of that power, will best execute the duties of his office; and the nominating power, in the first instance, and the confirming power, on application for the purpose, must be governed by its own judgment.

There can be no exception to this rule, but in cases where the appointing power is a trustee to carry into effect the will of some other person, a case which does not exist in regard to the establishment of the new Professors, or the new arrangement of the Statutes of the theological department.

The old complaint, too '*painful*' to be dwelt on by Dr. Codman, we do not now propose to discuss; to wit, that the fund of the Hollis Professorship is misapplied. Enough has been said on this subject in a former Number of our work;* but we allude to it, as Dr. Codman has done, to observe, in passing, how careful he has been to charge his battery with every missile that might be supposed to wound the College, or to injure it in the opinion of the public.

But the duty, which might otherwise devolve on the government of a College, to appoint men of its own views to the Professorships, is denied in regard to Harvard College by Dr. Codman, not only because of its connexion with the State, to which we have sufficiently attended, but because the present government is Unitarian, and 'Harvard College was not *founded* by Unitarians, but by Orthodox Congregationalists.'

* See the Christian Examiner, No. xxxiv, for September, 1829.

This objection, which is a very popular one with Dr. Codman's friends, seems to us to be extraordinary as an argument in the mouths of religious men. It is as much as to say, You, gentlemen of the government, must sacrifice your own ideas of duty to the supposed opinions of men, who lived two hundred years ago, and who never had heard in their lifetime of the sentiments, the illustrations, and evidence, which during this long period have been accumulating, for the guidance and instruction of this and future generations.

But let us attend to this matter a little more in detail.

Harvard College was founded by Orthodox Congregationalists, therefore only Orthodox Congregationalists can be Professors! But it was founded by royalists, subjects of the British crown, therefore such men must teach politics and the exact sciences. The logic is as good in one case as the other — idle in both. There are two classes of founders. The one, they who appropriate funds for particular specified objects; the other, such as aid, by money or other services, in erecting an establishment for the general purposes of education. Now we desire to be informed whether, independently of the question of specific appropriation, Dr. Codman would contend, that to all future time the theological doctrines to be taught at Cambridge must be the same as those of the founders two hundred years ago.

The right to take funds appropriated by the donor for the propagation of one set of opinions, and with them obtain means of disseminating others, is one question; the right of adding new branches of education, of extending the original design, and inculcating theological opinions different from the opinions of the founders, with other funds acquired long after they were in their graves, is another. No sensible man, we should suppose, would doubt the existence of this latter right; and yet we are not sure but that Dr. Codman, by mixing the two cases together, intends something more than to produce a confusion, which may aid his cause before the people. We are not sure that he does not mean to contend, that because the College was founded by Orthodox Congregationalists, it must always have and possess an Orthodox character; and that no doctrines in theology must now be taught, that would not have been acceptable two centuries ago. Unless the Doctor is thus bewildered by the darkening tendency of the system he espouses, we see no pertinency in his remarks.

The question of the Hollis Professorship is altogether distinct from the Statutes of the Theological Faculty, although the Hollis Professor is required to give instruction in part. The Statutes provide for the continuance of a department of recent origin, founded in modern times by individual munificence, and added to the College to complete its character as a University.

To suppose that such an addition cannot be made, with the new funds appropriated to it, is to limit the utility of all such institutions by the ignorance or illiberality of the age in which they were erected. We might as well expect the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge to teach the superstitions of the monks, and propagate popery. For every advance of the human mind we must, on these principles, have a new College; and the older institutions, instead of leading in the progress of mind, would but serve like tomb-stones, to show where its ancient errors had been buried.

But Dr. Codman reserves his great guns for an attack on the Faculty of the School, as it is formed by the Statutes. The President of the College is to be its head; and the President is a layman! This is indeed the whole argument. The Doctor is so self-satisfied, he seems to think this a proposition so plain, and the conclusion so irresistible, that it is useless to draw it out in form. But he rings again and again the changes on the cry, that the President is a layman. A layman the head of a theological faculty! 'Tell it not in Gath.' 'What will the enemies of our holy religion now say.' We cannot answer for the sayings either of friends or enemies, open or disguised; and while we care not for enemies' sayings, we will tell him what we think the friends of religion ought to say. They, and he among them, ought to admire the liberal and rational spirit, which has at last found out that theology is to be taught as other science is taught, by human means, by the application of mental effort and personal labor. That although the object to be attained is inexpressibly important, the way to attain it is the same, by which all knowledge is acquired; and that neither clergymen nor laymen, *as such*, but intelligent and learned men, are the proper persons to communicate the instruction required. He, and they too, ought to felicitate the world, that here the human mind has broken away from the shackles of bigotry, superstition, and ecclesiastical pride, and is enabled to get

clear from those ancient errors, the wiles of priestcraft, which once imposed on the people the abominable deception, that there was something too sacred in theology for any body but priests to communicate, or any but intended priests to understand; that there was a certain mystery about it, which only holy orders and a bishop's breath could give the right to discover and unfold. These days have passed away. And although the argument of the learned Divine proceeds on the presumption, that the world has stood still for half a century, they to whom the speech is addressed, are too wise to go back again to those dark periods, when priests had all the learning, or pretended to have all, that it was useful to communicate.

The question resolves itself into this; Is the present head of the University fit for the place assigned him by these Statutes? In that place he presides as head of the theological faculty, precisely as he is the head of the academic or the legal or the medical departments. In neither is he called to give the details of instruction. No man could be found with ability or time to do this in each of these various branches. But he is not, as Dr. Codman says he may be told, a '*nominal head.*' By no means. He is to be the director and overseer. He is to superintend the general duties of professors and students; to maintain that control and authority, which keeps each part of the grand machinery of a public institution in its regular and appropriate place; to take care of the common good of the whole, that there may be no confusion, collision, and disorder; to be, in the University, what, by the Constitution of the United States, the President is in the nation, who *virtute officii* becomes commander of its army, admiral of its fleet, and head of its executive, diplomatic, and domestic affairs, without the possibility of being professionally skilled in all these several departments, and yet infusing into all the vigor of a sound, comprehensive, and controlling mind.

We cannot part with this subject, without taking from Dr. Codman and his friends (for we suppose he means to speak for them) all praise for candor in not opposing the election of the 'distinguished layman' who presides over the University. Whatever they did at that election, was on the most refined and calculating principles of party policy. They had no chance of occupying the high office,—'no son of theirs suc-

ceeding.' Of a clergyman or layman, the latter would do least injury to their sect; the former would be more likely to be identified with their opponents, or at any rate, if he was eminent enough to succeed, his success must be derived from his professional, and perhaps his controversial character. It was liberal in the dominant party to propose a layman, and very wise in the Orthodox not to oppose the nomination. We find in their conduct a shrewd and safe calculation for their party.

We have only one more topic to comment on in the Speech of Dr. Codman. It is the insinuation every where conveyed, that the erecting of a theological department is to get the influence of the College in favor of Unitarianism.

Now, as members of that sect, we utterly disclaim any such intention. Our doctrines are not to be disseminated by any other influence than the power of truth, the force of conviction, the weight of argument, and the expansion of the human mind. Proselytism is out of the question. It might as well be attempted to make proselytes in mathematics or philosophy. Our system of faith is the result of education and study, of reason and judgment. It comes not by enthusiasm, or fervor, or artificial excitement, or the example of great names, or the weight of authority. Whether true or false, it is to be maintained and propagated by instructing, informing, enlarging, and strengthening the intellectual faculties, and making religion, which at one time has been covered in the garb of superstition, and at others sublimated beyond the reach of human vision by the fanaticism of its teachers, plain and palpable in all the beauty of its natural simplicity, and all the intelligibleness of truth.

But if the design imputed to the government of the College were true, these means to further such a design would have been exceedingly injudicious. The College, without this new department, was Unitarian. That was the character it had in the estimation of the Orthodox party, and it could gain no stronger character by the proposed change. On the contrary, a school separate from the College would have been reputed another Unitarian Institution; and this double establishment would have more effectually promoted the influence complained of, than the joining of both in one. Besides we may presume, that in the latter case the School, founded as it has been, for the most part, by Unitarians,

would have been placed more exclusively under Unitarian control.

The truth is, that no such design ever existed; and if any such influence is perceived or hereafter may be felt, it will be the natural and necessary consequence of that spirit of free inquiry and personal examination and private judgment, which are the characteristics of the age; and which, lead where they will, our humble endeavours shall at all times be devoted to promote.

Such inquiry and examination, we believe, will favor Unitarian doctrines; and so far we admit that the new School, by encouraging inquiry, will promote Unitarianism. But in no other sense is it a sectarian Institution. In no fair sense is the College or the School to be charged with that character. As far as truth can be taught, independent of sects or party; as far as religion can be illustrated, without sectarian bias; as far as examination and study can be carried on, not to promote preconceived opinions, but to aid in fixing the judgment by the results they produce; so far this School will teach theology, as other schools teach law or medicine, freely, impartially, and candidly.

Let it again and for ever be remembered, that here are no Professors bound to limit their belief by their present attainments. Here are no bounds fixed and impassable, beyond which it is criminal to stray. Here no pupils are controlled by obligations which they do not understand. 'The world is all before them where to choose, and Providence their guide.'

Whatever can be obtained to aid the freest and widest inquiry is provided for by the Statutes of the establishment, and the conditions on which its funds are held; and if the consequence is, that it promotes the cause of liberal Christianity, it is because that cause is founded on a rock, and has the divine assurance, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

ART. II. — *The certain Triumph of the Redeemer. A Discourse delivered in Murray Street Church, New York.* By FRANCIS WAYLAND, D. D., President of Brown University.

WE always expect from Dr. Wayland strong and original views, in clear and eloquent language. We find them in the Discourse before us. And as we presume, from the manner of its publication, that it is little likely to fall in the way of our readers, we propose to lay before them a brief abstract, with a selection of some passages which seem to us well deserving attention. It is the design of the preacher to prove the final universal prevalence of the Christian Religion. The manner in which the argument is conducted, and the illustrations by which the several portions are enforced, will be perceived, even from our brief notice, to be singularly striking and forcible.

After an introduction, intended to prepare the mind for the sort of reasoning by which it is to be addressed, the preacher states three grounds for believing, 'that the gospel of Jesus Christ will universally prevail.' The first is, 'its adaptedness to gratify the wants of the sensitive part of our nature.' Under this head he shows the wonderful excellence and fulness of its moral adaptation, by which it is adequate to the solution of all moral phenomena, and a complete guide in all moral duty; whence 'there is the same sort of reason to believe that the precepts of the Bible will be read, and studied, and obeyed, as there is to believe that the system of Newton will finally prevail'; the one occupying in ethics the same comprehensive and universal application to man's necessities and desires, which the other holds in physics.

From its moral he passes to illustrate its intellectual suitableness for universal reception. Here he shows, that, for the gratification of our taste for the sublime and beautiful, no book is so richly qualified as the Bible; selecting for examples of this the Scriptural conceptions of character, and views of futurity, and adding the remedy which Christianity has provided for the sense of guilt and apprehensions of divine wrath, which have always weighed heavily on the human mind. The conclusion is as follows;

'Now, setting aside altogether the fact, that, thus far, wherever these notions of religion have been taught, all others have soon ceased to be either known or thought of, I ask, whether a system which sheds such light upon all the relations of man, which so fills his conceptions with all that is beautiful and sublime in morals, which proffers to him an immortality more glorious than aught that elsewhere the mind of man had conceived, must not, from the principles of human nature, be in the end universally received.'

The substance of the second argument we prefer to give in the words of the author himself. His position is, that the Creator has given intimations, in the history of the world, that the Christian religion shall finally prevail. After stating some of the laws and principles of evidence, he proceeds in the following passage.

'Let us now apply these principles to the case before us. It is, I suppose, granted, that a variation, clear and indisputable, from the established succession of cause and effect, or of antecedent and consequent, is a sufficient proof of the interposition of Deity; for none but He could have thus varied the mode of his own operation. Nor can it be denied, that, if such a variation from the acknowledged laws of cause and effect be indissolubly connected with instructions purporting to come from God, God does in fact render himself responsible for the truths of all that is thus delivered.

'Now we say, that the first promulgation of the Gospel of of Jesus Christ was attended with such a variation from the laws of cause and effect, that the interposition of Deity must necessarily be supposed, in order to account for it; and, therefore, for the truth of whatever that Gospel reveals, the moral character of the Deity is responsible.

'The apostles and disciples and the men of that day did most certainly believe, that they saw the eyes of the blind opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped, the lepers cleansed, and the dead raised, by the word of Jesus of Nazareth; and also, that, after having seen him crucified, dead, and buried, they saw him alive again, conversed with him, walked with him; and that they afterwards saw him, under most remarkable circumstances, ascend up into heaven.

'Now, I say, the question here really is not, whether there *was* any variation from the regular succession of cause and effect, but where was that variation. Either these events took place at the word of Jesus Christ, or they did not. If they *did* take place, as the evangelists relate them, the varia-

tion consists in this, that God in this case suspended the laws of cause and effect, and made a single word to become the antecedent of changes totally unlike to any which, either before or since, have ever been known. And if this be so, then He has intended to render himself responsible for all that has been taught in connexion with such an interposition. If, on the contrary, these events did not take place at the word of Jesus Christ, then every individual of a great number of men either believed they saw what they did not see, or they saw what did not exist. There must have been, therefore, a variation from the laws of cause and effect, in the case of every several individual who supposed himself a spectator; that is, instead of a variation in one case, a variation in a thousand cases. Now such a departure from the laws of cause and effect could have been produced only by the Supreme Being, and it was inseparably connected with the promulgation of the Gospel. Just as much then, as in the other case, does it render the Supreme Being responsible for all that we find there either as precept or prophecy. On either supposition, the proof is full and decisive.

'Such, then, is one view of the principles on which rests our belief, that the agency of Deity was concerned in the promulgation of this system; and, therefore, that his veracity is responsible for the truth of it. The applications of the principle are various. In the Old Testament, the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish church, the separation of the Jews from all other nations, the facts connected with the prophecies which the sacred books contain, are inexplicable, upon any other supposition. Beside these, the fact, that a few fishermen of Galilee should have discovered a new moral system, thousands of years in advance of their age; a system which does, beyond question, embody the moral laws by which the universe is governed, can be in no other manner explained. Grant that God spake, and all is revealed; deny it, and all is mystery. Grant that God spake, and there is one miracle; deny it, and there are ten thousand.

'Now, in the examination of evidence, there is no religion whatever. It is a mere matter of science, and to be decided by the laws of science. In answer to what we have said, therefore, it will not do to laugh at religion, nor rail at enthusiasm. If a man disbelieve what we have here attempted to prove, let him show a reason for it. Let him either show a fallacy in our reasonings, or else allow our conclusion. If he will do neither, let him confess that he does not believe, though he cannot tell why he does not, and thus he waives the juris-

diction of reason, and puts himself on a level with the enthusiasts whom he so much derides.'

We must give the third argument also in the language of the author.

'Thirdly. The elements of society have been so combined as manifestly to tend to such a result as revelation has predicted.

'The nature of the proof in this case is as follows. It is taken for granted, that men are endowed with various desires essential to their existence in its present state. Many of these desires can only be gratified in a state of society, and when other men, as well as the individual, obey the laws which the Creator has established. Now, it can be shown, conclusively, that these laws are essentially the same as those revealed in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Hence, when every man finds it for his own interest that himself and all other men should universally obey the precepts of the Gospel, it is evident that the love of happiness, essential to our sensitive nature, must in the end ensure its universal reception.'

The illustration of this principle is drawn from the laws which regulate the accumulation of national wealth. We wish that our political economists and active men of worldly wisdom would give them heedful consideration, and be persuaded that practical religion is the truest policy, and 'benevolence the greatest sagacity.' We should be inexcusable if we did not extract largely.

'It has been found, by the experience of ages, that the strongest stimulant which can possibly be applied to the productive energies both of body and of mind, is to allow every man to employ his whole power, physical and intellectual, in such manner as he chooses, if he do not so employ it as to interfere with the corresponding enjoyment of his neighbour. In other words, it has been found that nations grow rich and happy, just in proportion as every man, magistrate, and citizen, estimates every other man's happiness as dearly as his own; that is to say, when every man obeys the universal law of human action contained in the Scripture, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This is the reason why justice clothes a nation in plenty, while injustice curses it with want. This is the reason why so many nations on the earth, with meagre and stinted physical advantages, abound in the comforts and even the luxuries of life, while regions of exhaustless fertility,

under a Mahometan or Papal despotism, live from century to century on the brink of starvation. Thus it is that the Christian religion has frequently, in a few years, done more to promote the progress of civilization, than all other means united have ever done, in many generations.

'But this is not all. That a nation may grow rich, not only is it necessary that industry be exerted; beside this, the instruments, with which it may work and the material on which it is to be employed, in other words, capital, must be accumulated. If whatever is produced be immediately consumed on the gratification of the passions, not only are the means of future accumulation annihilated, but the power of the agent for labor is lessened, and hence must result an accelerated tendency to poverty. Capital can be accumulated only by self-denial, by the government of the passions, by investing all that portion of the results of industry, which is not needed for our temperate enjoyment, in some such manner as shall benefit the condition of our fellow-men. Now, this is just the discipline for which the Gospel prepares mankind. Its first lesson is self-denial. "Except a man deny himself, he cannot be my disciple." At the very outset, then, it prescribes entire subjugation of the passions, the very basis of all frugality. Another of its lessons is the necessity of individual and universal industry. "This we commanded you, that if any man would not work neither should he eat." Thus, while inculcating, as religious duties, industry and frugality, the Gospel teaches the soundest and most valuable lessons in the science of political economy. That nations, as well as individuals, can grow rich on no other principles, is as evident as demonstration. And, on the other hand, that a nation, practising the industry and frugality of the Gospel, must become wealthy, that is, must abound in all that is requisite to satisfy virtuous desire, is equally incontestable. Thus we see how closely is connected the prevalence of religion with the prosperity of an individual nation.

'Besides, where every individual is accumulating, the whole must accumulate, and, hence, such a nation must have an annual amount of wealth to offer in the markets of the world. But where shall she offer it. An indolent and profligate people, with imperfect skill and scanty capital, will have nothing to offer in return. It is not that they do not want the results of your labor and frugality, but that they have nothing wherewith to purchase them. A degraded and vicious people can never be valuable customers; for they must always be very limited consumers. To be aware of the force of these considerations,

compare our exports to a heathen, with those to a Christian nation; or those to a Protestant, with those to a Catholic nation; or those to the island of Great Britain, with those to the rich and thickly peopled shores of the Mediterranean.'

A further illustration of the position in question is given by showing the extreme impolicy of the slave-trade, and the wicked wastefulness of war; and the conclusion is, that as men must discover that their real interests, as nations and individuals, demand the taking the precepts of Jesus as the rules of conduct, they will at length do so. There is thus a tendency in the nature of man and of society toward the prevalence of the Christian religion.

A multitude of thoughts crowd upon our minds as we contemplate the views here brought before us; and we might easily extend our article into a long disquisition. But this is no part of our design. We have done what we intended, when we have thus put our readers in possession of some of the views contained in this fine discourse.

We ought to add, that the sermon on which we have been remarking, is one of thirteen discourses preached by distinguished men, at a stated Lecture, in the Murray Street Church, New York, and printed together in a volume. The others are of various interest and unequal merit, some deserving high commendation, some open to criticism. It would require more room than we have to spare to do justice to the merits or the defects of a volume thus composed.

ART. III. — Professor STUART's *Appendix* to his *Exegetical Essays on several Words relating to Future Punishment.* Andover. 1830. 12mo.

[A Letter. — Continued from page 63.]

AMONG the examined works of Aristotle, αἰών occurs five times in the treatise *de Mundo*, twice in the fourteen books of *Metaphysics*, and five times in the treatise *de Cœlo*. These twelve are the only instances in the examined works. It being my object to spread before you with all fairness the

conditions of this word, as it occurs in these ancient writings, I will here adduce the several instances in which it occurs, whether they be relevant to the particular object of my inquiry or not. The edition which I use is the folio edition of Duval, 1629. I will note the passages according to the pages in which they occur, and the portions of those pages marked by capital letters of the alphabet.

De Mundo, cap. 2. Vol. I. p. 601. E.

'*The upper part of it* [the universe] *is all and in every particular finished. Of which the most elevated, the dwelling-place of God, has been named heaven; and being full of divine bodies which we are accustomed to call stars, moving in a perpetual motion in one circumgyration and circle, acts in choral harmony with all these incessantly during* EXISTENCE [δι' αἰῶνος].'

They who see cause may say '*eternity*' for αἰῶνος here. I cannot, because I have evidence yet to be produced, that Aristotle did not consider *eternity* as being the meaning of αἰών. *An* EXISTENCE *capable of continuance according to its nature*, appears to have been the general meaning of this word in his use; but he sometimes employs it in the sense of *state* or *age*. One or the other of these meanings accords with the connexion in which it occurs in his writings without exception, so far as the present examination extends. In most instances, *existence* is the most appropriate term for expressing its import.

Cap. 5. p. 609. C.

'*Which of these things separately can be compared with the order of the heaven, and the relation of the stars, sun, and also the moon moving in most perfect measures from one* STATE [or age] *to another* STATE [or age] [ἐξ αἰῶνος εἰς ἕτερον αἰῶνα.]' —In any case *eternity* is not in αἰὼν here.

Cap. 5. p. 610. A.

Speaking of the many changes which are taking place upon the earth by reason of the growth and decay of vegetables, the life, actions, and death of animals, the influence of earthquakes, floods, flames, &c., he adds,

'*All these things seem to be done for her good, in order to maintain* [her] *safety during* EXISTENCE [τὴν δι' αἰῶνος σωτηρίαν παρέχειν].'

If there be any sense of duration in αἰὼν in this passage, it is much like that expressed by the speaker in Ecclesiastes

i. 4. 'Generation passeth away, and generation cometh, and the earth abideth *for ever;*' or 'endureth in an *uninterrupted existence*'; which seems most consonant to the antithesis intended in that passage. It is an antithesis between the *human race*, the existence of which is broken up into different generations, and that of the earth which endures without interruption. There certainly seems to have been a similarity of mind between Aristotle in this place and the speaker in Ecclesiastes; and *αἰὼν* in the use of the one seems to have borne the same import as in the mind of the other. There are those doubtless who will believe it to be *eternity;* I cannot, for reasons yet to be produced in regard to Aristotle, and on account of the antithesis evident in Ecclesiastes.

Cap. 5. p. 610. B. In the same connexion with the last instance, he remarks;

'*And one safety being perfected by all these, contending among themselves, continues; and while they sometimes conquer and sometimes are conquered, it preserves the whole incorruptible during* EXISTENCE [*φυλάττει τὸ σύμπαν ἄφθαρτον δι' αἰῶνος.*]'

Cap. 7. p. 615. C.

'*He* [God] *being one, has many names;* . . . . . *and they call him Jupiter and Dis; using interchangeably, those names by which we may call him by whom we live. He is also said to be* [the son] *of Saturn* [Eternity] *and of Time, extending through from an unlimited* EXISTENCE *to another* EXISTENCE [*διήκων ἐξ αἰῶνος ἀτέρμονος εἰς ἕτερον αἰῶνα.*]'

Metaph. Lib. XIV. cap. 7. Vol. II. p. 1001. A.

Ἡ γὰρ νοῦ ἐνέργεια ζωή· ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἡ ἐνέργεια· ἐνέργεια δὲ ἡ καθ' αὑτὴν, ἐκείνου ζωὴ ἀρίστη καὶ ἀΐδιος· φαμὲν δὲ τὸν θεὸν εἶναι ζῶον ἀΐδιον, ἄριστον· ὥστε ζωὴ καὶ αἰὼν συνεχὴς καὶ ἀΐδιος ὑπάρχει τῷ Θεῷ· τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ θεός.

'*The energy of mind indeed is life. And he is this energy. And this energy in itself is his life, most excellent and eternal. And we say, that God is a living being, eternal and most excellent. So that life and an* EXISTENCE *continuous and eternal appertain to God. Verily, this is God.*'

Here, then, the question is in one respect decided. Aristotle felt himself under the necessity of adding the adjective *ἀΐδιος*, in order to infuse a sense of *eternity* into *αἰών*. He was no Hebrew, and cannot be suspected of having made use of the expression, 'an eternal eternity.' It is evident,

from his using the adjective, that in his apprehension αἰὼν did not contain the meaning of *eternity*. The testimony of this sentence is positive in this respect, and governs that of the other places in which this word appears in his writings. In each of those produced, αἰὼν appears under circumstances of some doubt. There is not one in which the connexion positively requires the meaning of *eternity* for this word. But there are some in which it seems as if that might have been his meaning or might not. But here is a passage in which *eternity* cannot be the meaning of αἰών. Without the adjective the expression would have been as doubtful as any of the others; with the adjective the passage is decisive, and justifies the assertion, that in the other places also *eternity* is not the import of this word. In those places I have rendered it *existence* or *state;* and in this instance, *existence* is almost without the shadow of a doubt the meaning in the mind of Aristotle.

The concluding sentence of this last extract ought not to pass unnoticed, — '*Verily, this is God.*' What is God? '*An* EXISTENCE *continuous and eternal,*' living and acting in the *energy of mind, his own most excellent and eternal life.*' This is God. And what is this but saying, in other words, that God is SPIRIT; πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός? I will not say, that this proves αἰὼν to mean *spirit.* But in this case, the EXISTENCE which it represents is a spiritual one, and αἰὼν seems used of choice for exhibiting it. In truth, Aristotle after having described Deity as well as he could, and having summed up the whole description in '*an* EXISTENCE *continuous and eternal,*' seems to have been startled at the view which his own mind had taken, and the end at which it had arrived; and gathering his whole congregation of sublime ideas of Deity in the one 'EXISTENCE' present in his view, added the last sentence as an expression of this summary, — "Verily this [EXISTENCE, αἰὼν] is God."

Metaph. Lib. XIV. cap. 9. p. 1004. D.

'*Is every thing immaterial, indivisible, as the human mind? Or does it consist by means of things put together in some particular time? It is not at all well* [that it should consist] *always by means of this or that; but it is best* [that it should consist] *in a certain whole; being something distinct* [of itself;] *that so a true consciousness abides during the whole* EXISTENCE [ἔχει αὐτὴ αὑτῆς ἡ νόησις τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα.]'

The foregoing are all the instances of αἰὼν which I have found; and I believe them to be all which exist in those works of Aristotle before named, excepting *De Cœlo*. They contain as much of a spiritual meaning as is contained in the English word *existence*, and no more. There is some sense of spirituality in most cases accompanying that word, but nothing decisive. In the last two cases produced, the *existence* spoken of, being either that of God or of the human mind, is spiritual in itself; but this does not prove the spirituality of αἰών. It will, however, be observed that in every instance there is a sense of *secrecy of the nature* and *indefiniteness of the duration* of *the existence* expressed by this word, but in no case a sense of positive *eternity*. I have spread them before you because it is my object and desire to exhibit this word wherever and however I have found it in the present research; and because it is but fair, that you should hear what every witness says, whether testifying to one particular purpose or not. It is presumable also, that a word occurring so exceedingly seldom in works of this philosopher where *eternity* is frequently brought to view by other words, cannot have been very often used by him in other places for expressing that idea, if he ever so employs it. For the present, I must believe that he never makes use of it in that sense.

In the treatise *de Cœlo* I notice five instances of αἰὼν and no more. Three of these are in one passage, which, being a very important one, I reserve for a separate consideration, and produce the other two first.

Lib. I. cap. 10. Vol. I. p. 447, A.

'*And besides what has no beginning of being in this way, (but it is impossible otherwise to possess originally an entire* EXISTENCE [ἔχειν πρότερον τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα]), *also cannot change.*'

Lib. II. cap. 1. p. 452, D.

'*The entire heaven is one and eternal* [ἀΐδιος], *having neither beginning nor end of an entire* EXISTENCE [ἀρχὴν μὲν καὶ τελευτὴν οὐκ ἔχων τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος], *having and comprising in itself unlimited time.*'

In the same chapter ἀϊδιότης is employed in the sense of *eternity*, and in a manner which proves it to have signified something different from αἰών.

These are the only instances of αἰὼν in *De Cœlo*, excepting the passage before named as containing three instances of it. It occurs in *De Cœlo*, Lib. I. cap. 9, near the end

of the chapter. In this passage Aristotle describes particularly the meaning of αἰών· and by so doing furnishes essential aid to a correct understanding of its usage in his age. I am the more desirous to exhibit the passage at large, because many trusted critics have represented the philosopher in this place as giving the etymology of αἰών, and deciding its meaning to be *eternity*. Particularly the learned Adam Clarke in his note on Genesis xxi. 33,* observes,—'Αἰών according to Aristotle, *De Cœlo*, Lib. I. cap. 9, and a higher authority need not be sought, is compounded of ἀεὶ, *always*, and ὤν, *being* — αἰών ἐστιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι. The same author informs us that God was termed Aisan, because he was *always existing*, καλεῖται Αἴσαν δὲ, ἀεὶ οὖσαν. *De Mundo*, cap. 7, *in fine*. Hence we see that no words can more forcibly express the grand characteristics of *eternity* than these.' I have quoted Clarke thus at large, because he is not alone in his opinion of the meaning of Aristotle, and because, in a case like the present, the prevailing ideas upon the subject ought to be plainly stated; and because every one should be allowed to exhibit his mind in his own words. In Schleusner's Lexicon, this passage of Aristotle is referred to as authority for the etymology and meaning of αἰών in the same sense with Clarke; and so in other critical works. I believe that Clarke, as above quoted, expresses the opinion most generally prevailing with respect to it.

On the supposition that Aristotle intended to describe the etymology of αἰών in this passage, his assertions would be reverently regarded as high and venerable authority. But it must be remembered, that this word had existed a thousand years at least before Aristotle. He was neither present at its birth, nor was he a witness to the circumstances of its formation. Nor have we any cause to believe that he possessed more or better means for ascertaining the etymology of this or other words, than now exist in many of the public libraries of modern days, nay, not so many nor so good. I will hazard the remark, that Professor Stuart could within the space of a few hours avail himself of more and better aids of this kind, than were within the reach of the ancient philosopher during his whole life. While, there-

* 'Abraham called on the name of Jehovah, the *everlasting* God, [Θεὸς αἰώνιος.]'

fore, we would regard an opinion of Aristotle on the derivation of an ancient word, with the respect due to extensive learning and venerable age, still we must bear in mind that his opinion is not indisputable authority. We may go beyond it, and ascend to periods and states of greater antiquity, without committing a crime. Insomuch that were it the fact, that Aristotle was intending in this passage to describe the derivation of *αἰών*, and that he intended to represent it as signifying *eternity*, it would not necessarily follow that such is the true state of the case with respect to this word, excepting so far as he employed it in such a sense himself, and understood its meaning to be so in his own age. It might still remain that *αἰών* was composed according to his opinion, or that it was not. Nevertheless, his own modes of employing the term, and his opinion concerning its meaning in his own age, are of immense importance; inasmuch as he doubtless employed it in its then customary meaning, and lived and wrote at a period not very remote from that at which this word was employed by the Seventy for translating עולם; possibly, not to say *certainly*, it was employed by some translators of some parts of the Hebrew Scriptures while he was yet living, or had been so employed before his birth. If we can ascertain what he understood *αἰών* to signify, and what in his age it did signify in true Greek, we may confidently believe that it signifies the same, or nearly the same, in the Greek Scriptures.

I will now produce the passage in question, and the ancient philosopher shall speak for himself. In order to exhibit a fair view of the whole, I shall be obliged to quote more largely than would be desirable. But I know not how to avoid it without exposing myself to the imputation of not producing those associated expressions which may be thought essential to a correct understanding of this particular term. Perhaps also the inquiring mind may not disrelish a copious extract, exhibiting the opinions of one so great among the ancients, concerning the universe and things beyond it.

It may be well to premise, that Aristotle believed the universe to be composed of several concentric spheres, of which the earth was the central one, being encompassed by the others. The outermost or uppermost sphere he calls by the particular name *heaven* [*ὁ οὐρανός*]. But he does not always confine this name to this particular outermost sphere. He

employs the term occasionally to represent the *whole universe;* the container for the things contained. The outermost sphere he believed to be completely *bounded*, so that nothing from within could pass out, and nothing from without could pass in. Within this bounded universe he believed all things to exist of which we have any accurate conception. Even the habitations of the Gods, and the residence of the Supreme God himself, were in the *highest heaven* indeed, but still within the limit of the uppermost bounded sphere. He seems to have thought, that there might be 'things beyond' this encompassed universe. But he had no clear conception what they were. Whenever he speaks of them, therefore, he uses the language of negation only. He can say what they are *not*, but cannot say what they *are*, in any positive affirmation. With this explanation, the passage to be produced, may be readily understood by the reader unacquainted with the writings of this philosopher. It is as follows;

Φανερὸν ἄρα ὅτι οὔτε τόπος, οὔτε κενὸν, οὔτε χρόνος ἐστὶν ἔξωθεν. διόπερ οὔτ' ἐν τόπῳ τἀκεῖ πέφυκεν, οὔτε χρόνος αὐτὰ ποιεῖ γηράσκειν, οὐδ' ἐστὶν οὐδενὸς οὐδεμία μεταβολὴ τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξωτάτω τεταγμένων φορὰν, ἀλλ' ἀναλλοίωτα καὶ ἀπαθῆ, τὴν ἀρίστην ἔχοντα ζωὴν καὶ τὴν αὐταρκεστάτην διατελεῖ τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο τοὔνομα θείως ἔφθεγκται παρὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων. τὸ γὰρ τέλος τὸ περιέχον τὸν τῆς ἑκάστου ζωῆς χρόνον, οὗ μηδὲν ἔξω κατὰ φύσιν, αἰὼν ἑκάστου κέκληται. κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ λόγον καὶ τὸ τοῦ παντὸς οὐρανοῦ τέλος, καὶ τὸ τὸν πάντων ἄπειρον χρόνον καὶ τὴν ἀπειρίαν περιέχον τέλος, αἰὼν ἐστιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι εἰληφὼς τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν, ἀθάνατος καὶ θεῖος. ὅθεν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐξήρτηται, τοῖς μὲν ἀκριβέστερον, τοῖς δ' ἀμαυρότερον, τὸ εἶναί τε καὶ ζῆν.

'*It therefore is evident, that there is neither place, nor vacuum, nor time beyond* [the heaven]. *Wherefore the things there are not, by nature, adapted to be in place; nor does time make them grow old, nor is there any change of any one of those things which are ordained above the highest relation; but, unchangeable and passionless, having the best and self-sufficient life, they remain permanent, through entire* EXISTENCE [*διατελεῖ τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα*].* *And, truly, this*

* Here, if ever, I should say '*all eternity*,' for *ἅπαντα αἰῶνα*· and I may suffer reproach for not doing it. But the connexion does not necessarily require it; the already exhibited evidences of the meaning of *αἰὼν*, in ancient Greek, forbid it; and the description of that word,

noun [sc. *αἰὼν*, EXISTENCE] *was pronounced as something divine, by the ancients. For, completeness, which comprehends the time of each one's life, of which* [*time*] *nothing is beyond* [*what is*] *according to nature, has been called each one's* EXISTENCE [*αἰών*]. *And, for the same reason also, the completeness of the whole heaven, and this completeness comprehending the unlimited time of all things, and illimitedness, is an* EXISTENCE [*αἰὼν*], (*having assumed the title, on account of permanently* [or *always*] *existing* [*ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι*]*), *deathless and divine. Whence, also, it has been annexed to other things; in some indeed more clearly, in others more obscurely,* [expressing] *existence and life* [or *the existing and living*].'

I cannot help experiencing some doubt, whether Adam Clarke, and those critics who have spoken after the same manner with him concerning this place in Aristotle, had ever read the passage, when they composed their notes. There may be some difficulty in deciphering the precise meaning of the philosopher, in some of his expressions. For here, as elsewhere, he is at times notoriously obscure. I am not, therefore, disposed to contend for the exact correctness of every particular of the above translation. But it is perfectly evident, that he considers *αἰὼν* to signify, in strict propriety, *a thing completed*, so as to be *permanent*, or *enduring*, as long as its nature admits. He means to say, that a thing completed according to its nature is called *αἰὼν* [an EXISTENCE], on account of its *existing* permanently or enduringly; the period of its permanency, or enduring, being conformed to its nature. This might, in some cases, lead onward to

---

which immediately follows in this same passage, places a still more effectual *veto* to translating it *eternity*. *Existence* corresponds well with the connexion; and I believe it to have been the true meaning, in the mind of Aristotle

* 'A semper essendo appellatione assumptâ.'—Jo. Arg. Byz.

There is a similar form of expression concerning the Æther, in *De Cœlo*, Lib. 1. cap. 3, p. 435 B Αἰθέρα προσωνόμασαν τὸν ἀνωτάτω τόπον, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεῖν ἀεὶ τὸν ἄϊδιον χρόνον, θέμενοι τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν αὐτῷ. 'They [the ancients] *have named the highest region Æther; having affixed this surname to it on account of its running on continuously, through perpetual time.*' In this passage it is plain, that *ἀεὶ* means merely *continuously*, and that *ἄϊδιον χρόνον* was requisite, in order to make that 'continuously' *eternal*. The *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι* of the passage under consideration, is in the same predicament with the *ἀπὸ τοῦ θεῖν ἀεὶ* in the above extract, and would need the same addition to render its *ἀεὶ everlasting*.

eternity *a parte post*, but does not necessarily, nor even naturally, imply it. Ἀεὶ ὤν is a form of speech which is used at times, and indeed not unfrequently, by ancient Greek writers, to signify *eternal*. But *eternal* is not the peculiar force of this expression. *Continuously*, or *permanently existing*, is the sense in which it most frequently occurs; and the adverb ἀεὶ, alone, is employed by them, in times without number, in the sense of *continuously* or *incessantly*, like the Latin *semper*, or the English *always*, leaving the period of the incessant continuance indefinite. Instances could be multiplied in great numbers, were it requisite; but they need not be.

On the foregoing passage, in Aristotle, I remark;—

1. It is vehemently to be doubted, whether he intended, herein, to describe the *etymology* of αἰών. Had such been his object, it is most likely he would have employed a different mode of expression. Phavorinus affirms, that this word is derived from ἀεὶ and ὤν· but he uses a very different form of speech for asserting it;— *Ἴνεται δὲ αἰὼν ἐκ τοῦ ἀεὶ καὶ τοῦ ὤν· ὁμοίως ἐκ τοῦ ἀεικίζειν, τὸ αἰκίζειν δῆλον ἐστιν.* '*Αἰὼν is formed from ἀεὶ and ὤν· in the same manner as αἰκίζειν plainly is from ἀεικίζειν*·'—a very different mode of expression from the ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι of Aristotle, and signifying a very different idea. Aristotle seems to have been expressing a reason for the name, derived from its *nature* and *quality*, rather than from its etymology.

2. A *human existence* is αἰών, in his understanding of the term. As surely, then, as *human existence* is not *eternal*, so surely αἰὼν is not *eternity*, in his mind.

3. In regard to the expression, 'the unlimited [ἄπειρον] time of all things, and illimitedness [ἀπειρίαν],' this may, to some, seem to attach the idea of eternity to αἰών. But I do not conceive it has any such force, or even tendency. Aristotle, it is well known, believed the universe to be *eternal*. He, therefore, very naturally alludes to its *eternity*, when speaking of it. But it was not its eternity which made it an EXISTENCE [αἰών]. Its *completeness*, its being a perfect system of things, all harmonizing to form *one great whole*, so as to be a thing capable of *continuance*, is what makes it an *existence*, or a *being*. This *completeness* comprehends, of course, the *duration* of the subject, among other things requisite to constitute the EXISTENCE. In this particular

case, the duration contemplated is eternal. He, therefore, speaks of 'unlimited time,' and 'illimitedness' (or *infinity*, if you prefer this word), as forming a part in that EXISTENCE [*αἰὼν*] now under consideration; but only because such 'unlimited time' happens to belong to the particular EXISTENCE in question. But in the preceding sentence, where the EXISTENCE represents *human life*, the *duration* referred to is certainly *temporary*. In either case, *αἰὼν* [*existence*] has no concern with *duration*, any further than as *duration* of some kind is comprehended in the idea of every *existence*, whether material or spiritual, temporary or eternal. But whether the *duration* of a particular *existence*, at any time in question, be eternal or temporary, must be ascertained from its nature, qualities, or circumstances, and not from the use of *αἰὼν* with respect to it. This word expresses the EXISTENCE or the BEING alone, comprehending the nature, qualities, condition, circumstances, and, among them, the *duration*, of the particular existence contemplated.

4. Aristotle, in speaking of the universe, calls it 'a *deathless* and *divine* existence.' In Lib. II. cap. 1, he affirms it to have been the opinion of the *ancients*, and especially of 'our fathers,' that the universe was something 'deathless and divine'; and maintains, that their doctrine was true. In assigning to the completed universe this title, 'a deathless and divine existence,' he assigns to the *existence* in question, qualities as purely *spiritual* as thought can conceive. In this particular sentence, his allusion is to the *heaven* [*οὐρανὸς*], as comprehending, within its all-embracing sphere, the entire universe. And it should be remembered, that, notwithstanding *we* believe the universe to be material, yet in the days of the ancients, the *celestial* bodies, in particular, which were most prominent in his view when contemplating the universe, were believed to exist, consist, and be actuated, each by its own peculiar *spirit*, abiding in and actuating the whole mass. They were believed to contain the habitations of the Gods, and even of the Supreme Divinity; and were thus thought to be instinct with *spirit* and *life*. Hence Aristotle, elsewhere, calls them *divine bodies*. The *deathless* and *divine*, therefore, applied to a completed universe, thus filled with soul, is purely *spiritual* in its nature, be its term of duration whatever it may. I do not affirm, that this proves a spiritual sense to belong to *αἰὼν* in itself. But viewed in

connexion with the *devout* manner in which the name was pronounced by the *ancients*, and the readiness with which it associates itself with the existence of God and man, and the *deathless* and *divine*, it may go as far as it will to prove, that a *spiritual* sense was always at hand to ally itself with this word, and so give a new support to other more positive testimonies in the case.

And, finally, Aristotle teaches, in the end, that, whatever may have been the original and peculiar meaning of *αἰὼν*, its import, in the common usage of the Greek language, was simply EXISTENCE *and* LIFE, or *the existing* and *living*. So far, then, as a ready association with the *deathless* and *divine* evinces a spiritual tendency and import in that which thus cordially unites with divinity and immortality; and so far as *existence* and *life* are spiritual subjects, so far, and so surely, was a sense of *spirituality* attached to *αἰὼν* in the days of Aristotle. And as certainly as *human life* is not *eternal*, so certainly *αἰὼν* did not contain the meaning of *eternity*.

In confirmation of the meaning assigned to *αἰὼν*, in the foregoing passage from Aristotle, viz. a completed or perfect *existence*, that is, perfect *according to its nature*, I could here produce a passage from Hippocrates, *περὶ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. It may be found at the end of his work *Περὶ Σαρκῶν*. I dare not make the son of Æsculapius speak English, to any great extent; or I would bring him on the stand to tell the *whole* truth. But I have pointed out the passage, and if you wish, you can consult it. It is evident, that, by the *αἰὼν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, he means *a human existence*, or *principle of being, so completed as to be able to continue itself by appropriating to itself fitting nourishment.* In other words, *αἰὼν* is an *existence complete* in respect to its nature and power of continuance through its proper term; (it is *αἰὼν* [an *existence*] on account of continuously existing; in the words of Aristotle, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι·*) and when for any cause, the power of continuance fails, then the *existence* or *being* [*αἰὼν*] ceases. I here present an extract from Hippocrates;

Ὁ δὲ αἰὼν ἐστι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἑπταήμερος. . . . . δῆλον δὲ τόδε ὅτι ἑπταήμερος ὁ αἰὼν, εἴ τις ἐθέλει ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας φαγέειν ἢ πιέειν μηδέν. οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἐν αὐτῇσιν. εἰσὶ δέ τινες καὶ οἳ ὑπερβάλλουσιν, ἀποθνήσκουσι δ' ὅμως.

'*A human* EXISTENCE [being] *is a seven days' matter. ..... It may be plain from this, that the* EXISTENCE [a being capable of continuance] *is a seven days' matter, if any one will, for seven days, neither eat nor drink any thing; for, indeed, most die within those* [days]; *but if any survive them, still they die likewise.*' In other words, a seven days' abstinence from nourishment dissolves the *existence* having power of continuance; the *αἰὼν* is destroyed; the *τὸ ἀεὶ εἶναι* is no more. The *αἰὼν* of Hippocrates is, without dispute, the same with the *αἰὼν* of Aristotle. Its meaning is certainly *an* EXISTENCE *capable of continuing itself for so long a period as its nature admits.* In regard to the *human* being, with respect to which Hippocrates employs it, it means the same as the *vital principle*, which differs but little, if at all, from *πνεῦμα*, or *spirit.* The Chian may be admitted as good evidence for the meaning of words, although the medical faculty may have no great faith in the truth of his doctrine.

Hierocles gives us a fragment from Empedocles, the Pythagorean, containing the word in question, which may not be aside from the subject in hand. Hierocles speaks thus; '*Man descends and falls from a happy region; as Empedocles, the Pythagorean, saith,* "An exile from God, and a wanderer, agitated with an insane contention." *But he ascends and resumes his original condition,* "if he flees from earthly things, and the joyless region," *as the same saith,* "where murder, rage, and hosts of other evils abide," *into which they who fall* "wander through the field" *of Até,* "and darkness." *But the desire of him who flees from the field of Até, impels him towards the field of truth; which leaving, in the impetus of a downward flight, he comes into an earthly body,* "deprived of" a happy "EXISTENCE," [*ὀλβίου — αἰῶνος ἀμέρθεις.*]' Certainly *αἰῶνος*, in this place, cannot signify *eternity;* for the Pythagoreans believed the soul to be as much eternal when in the human body as when out of it. The contrast, drawn by Empedocles, is between the happy *existence* [mode, or condition of being] which the soul enjoyed before its fall, and the unhappy state associated with the body, in which it is compelled to endure its punishment. *Existence*, or *mode*, or *condition of being*, without taking *duration* into account, is the evident meaning of *αἰὼν*, in this

place, whether it were an eternal or a temporary state. We know, however, that the existence, or state of being, contemplated, was wholly a *spiritual* one, in direct contradistinction to the earthly state in association with body; and we know further, that it was not eternal; for it came to an end when the soul fell.

In Euripides, I notice thirty-two instances of *αἰὼν*, either separate or in compositon. I have endeavoured to arrange them according to the meaning which the word, in the individual cases, seems to bear. You will, of course, accept or reject my arrangement, as you see cause. The habitual meaning of *αἰὼν*, in Euripides, is either simply *existence;* or the *state* in which one exists; or the *person* or *soul* existing; or the *spirit*. These meanings are mostly of a *spiritual* family, and some of them are *spirit* itself. It will not be requisite to quote entire passages in the Greek in every instance; it is thought sufficient, generally, to present what seems to be a correct translation, in each case pointing out the place where the original may be found.

In the following instances, *αἰὼν* signifies *state*, or *condition*, without reference to any special *term* or *period*, and without having any express idea of *duration* annexed to it; any farther than as duration, of some kind, is always implied in mere *existence*. It is *existence* considered as *state* or *condition*, which *αἰὼν* here expresses; which state may be longer or shorter, as the case may be. In these instances, the existence or state represented, is commonly *human*, that is, the human *condition of being;* but in one it represents a *future* state, and in another the state of the *dead*.

I use a small German edition, in which the lines are not numbered as in some others; yet not varying so much, but that the instances can be readily found.

Hec. 754. 'Agam. *What benefit are you seeking? Is it, to obtain a free* EXISTENCE [*ἐλεύθερον αἰῶνα*]?

'Hec. *Not by any means; but, rather, punishing the wicked, I would be a slave through my whole* EXISTENCE [human life] [*αἰῶνα τὸν ξύμπαντα*].' — In this second instance it may be *period;* but I place it here, because of its connexion with the first.

Orest. 596. *Marriage, to those mortals who are well situated, is a happy* STATE [μακάριος αἰών].

Ibid. 971. Βροτῶν δ' ὁ πᾶς ἀστάθμητος αἰών.

'*Every* CONDITION *of mortals is unstable.*'

Phœniss. 1498. '*We may even see the bodies of the three dead, now before the houses; by a common death, having their lot in a dark* STATE [σκοτίαν αἰῶνα].'

Med. 245. '*And if with us, enduring these things well, a husband may cohabit, not imposing the yoke heavily,* EXISTENCE *is desirable* [ζηλωτὸς αἰών]; *but if not, it is better to die.*'

Ibid. 646. '*Having an* EXISTENCE *closely encompassed with difficulties* [δυσπέρατον αἰῶνα].'

Hippol. 1123. '*Man's* STATE *is often changed* [μετὰ δ' ἵσταται ἀνδράσιν αἰών], *always subject to great alterations.*'

Androm. 1218. '*Ah, wretched old man, suffering and seeing evils; what an* EXISTENCE [τὶν' αἰῶνα] *shalt thou have in future!*'

Suppl. 1008. '*About to end, in the grave, a laboring life, and the evils of* EXISTENCE [αἰῶνός τε πόνους].'

Iphigen. in Aul. 1517. '*Another* STATE, *and another lot, are we about to inhabit* [ἕτερον αἰῶνα, καὶ μοῖραν].'

Iphigen. in Taur. 1129. '*To endure misfortune, after prosperity, is the unhappy* STATE *of mortals* [βαρὺς αἰών].'

Bacch. 92. '*Whom his mother brought forth, herself leaving* EXISTENCE [λιποῦσ' αἰῶνα] *in a thunder storm.*'

In composition:

Suppl. 962. '*Their life* [that of childless women] *is an unhappy* EXISTENCE [δυσαίων].

Iphigen. in Aul. 552.

Τὸ μὲν ἐπ' εὐαίωνι πότμῳ,
Τὸ δ' ἐπὶ συγχύσει βιοτᾶς.

'*One shall tend to a prosperous, benignant* EXISTENCE, *the other to confusion of life*;' [human *state*, in either case, expressed by either word.]

Bacch. 426. '*He, to whom these things have no interest, is not willing, by day, or pleasant night, to live a benignant* LIFE [εὐαίωνα διαζῆν].'

It will not be doubted, I trust, that in these sixteen instances, αἰὼν signifies either simple *existence*, or *state*, or *condition* of existence, without the least reference to its *period* or *duration*. Certainly, there is nothing like *eternity* in any one of them.

In the following instances, αἰὼν may have been intended to express *period*, or *term*; most commonly, the *term of human life*. *Existence* would, in most cases, answer to the connexion; but as *period* may have been intended, I place them separate.

Phœniss. 1537. '*Having, hereafter, to carry through* EXISTENCE [human life, αἰῶνα] *alone.*'

Med. 428. 'OLD AGE [a long life, μακρὸς δὲ αἰὼν] *has many things to say concerning our own and other men's fate.*'

Hippol. 1444. '*For unmarried virgins, previous to marriage, shall cut off their hair for thee, during a long* PERIOD [δι' αἰῶνος μακροῦ].'

Alcest. 486. '*Surely she should live with me, free from trouble, during* EXISTENCE [human life, δι' αἰῶνος].'

Bacch. 395. '*And not wisely to contemplate things as mortal, is a short* EXISTENCE [or short-lived *state*, βραχὺς αἰὼν].'

Heracl. 903. '*For fate, the disposer of events, and* EXISTENCE [or time], *the child of Saturn, bring forth many things* [αἰών τε Κρόνου παῖς].'

Ion, 637. '*Who is blest, who is fortunate, that timorously, and watching against violence, painfully protracts* EXISTENCE [human life, αἰῶνα τείνει]?'

In most of these seven instances, the peculiar force of αἰὼν is doubtful. It may signify either a *period*, or *term* of human life; or the human *state* of existence, without reference to a particular term.

In the following four instances, a sense of *personality* appears to belong more particularly to αἰών. The word seems to express the *personal* condition of the individual existent; with reference to his outward circumstances, and inward condition of mind;—the *state*, which is associated with his

individual *existence*, and cannot be separated from his *personal* being.

Phœniss. 1549. '*Come forth from your house, aged father, bearing a darkened eye; O Œdipus, exhibit your wretched* EXISTENCE [σὸν αἰῶνα μέλεον].'

Suppl. 1087. '*Ah, me! Why is it not given to mortals to be twice young, and then again old? For, in our domestic affairs, if any thing be not well, by after thoughts we can amend it. But this cannot be, with respect to the* PERSONAL STATE [the state associated with, and mingled into our personal *existence*] [αἰῶνα δ' οὐκ ἔξεστιν]. *Now, if we were twice young and old, then, if any one sinned extensively; being allowed a double life, we might amend it.*'

I have placed these last two passages together, because, although taken from different tragedies, they refer to the same person, and same state of things; and I have quoted somewhat at large, for the sake of exhibiting the idea attached herein to αἰών. It is evidently the *personal state*, relating to both outward circumstances and the mind itself, into which man brings *himself*, by his course in this world. It is that *state*, which is so intimately associated with *himself* in person, that it exists only in his personal existence, and ceases when he ceases to exist. This sense of αἰών is peculiarly consonant to the connexion of these passages in the several tragedies, and equally so to the circumstances of αἰών in the passages. They both refer to Œdipus, who had murdered his father, and married his mother; had witnessed the suicide of his mother-wife; had put out his own eyes, and fled into exile. His whole *condition*, both of body and mind, outward circumstance and inward state of thought and feeling, his *personal state*, is what the poet designed to represent in that αἰών, or EXISTENCE, which could not be amended, unless he should be made young again, and create a new personal state, by a different course of life.

Indeed, in ancient languages, the term representing *persons*, was not far from equivalent to a term representing souls. It is something so now; for we often say, 'so many *souls*,' and mean 'so many *persons*.'

'*Exhibit your wretched* EXISTENCE,' in the first of these passages, is not far from equivalent to 'exhibit your wretched SELF.'

Helen. 215. *Αἰὼν δυσαίων*
Τὶς ἔλαχεν, ἔλαχεν, κ. τ. λ.

'*An* EXISTENCE *received an allotment, what a painful* EXISTENCE [human destiny, associated with the person] *received an allotment, when Jupiter produced you from your mother.*'

Αἰὼν, in this instance, seems to comprehend both the human *destiny*, and the *person* by whom that destiny was *fated* to be filled and completed.

In the following instances, *αἰὼν* seems more particularly to signify the *person* or *being* existing; and that person in a *spiritual* respect, that is, the *soul*, or *spirit*.

Ion, 126. *Ὦ Παιὰν, ὦ Παιὰν,*
Εὐαίων, εὐαίων
Εἴης, ὦ Λατοῦς παῖ.

'*O Phœbus, O Phœbus, mayest thou be a benignant* BEING [spirit]; *a benignant* BEING [spirit], *O son of Latona.*'

The same address to Apollo is repeated in the same words, line 141, &c.

Herc. Fur. 673. '*Now, there is no prescribed distinction from the gods, for the good or the evil; but every* EXISTENCE [individual, living one life only] [*τις αἰὼν*] *self-involved, is accumulating wealth alone.*'

Seeing a spiritual or personal meaning in the last five instances, one may be justified in believing that a similar meaning belongs to *αἰὼν*, in some of the other instances before produced, where the connexion does not so positively determine its precise import. Indeed the last nine instances are none of them without a good share of the sense of *spirituality;* for they relate decisively to the person and state of the *thinking*, *feeling*, and *intelligent* EXISTENCE.

To the above, I will now add the passage from the lost tragedy of Philoctetes, preserved by Hesychius;

Ἀπέπνευσεν αἰῶνα.

'*He breathed out the* SPIRIT;' an expression not varying in meaning from the *ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα* [*he gave up the* GHOST] of the Greek Scriptures. On this passage, Hesychius remarks, that Euripides, in Philoctetes, calls *αἰῶνα the soul*

[ψυχήν]. And certainly αἰῶνα in Euripides, in this instance, signifies precisely the same as πνεῦμα in the above-named case in the Greek Scripture.

I need pursue this investigation no further. The instances produced show plainly, that αἰών, in these writers, never expresses positive *eternity*; in some few cases it may signify a *term* of duration; but more commonly, it expresses either simply *existence*, or *state*, or the *person* existing; and in many cases the *vital principle*, or *life*, or the *living spirit* itself.

If, among these more ancient Greek writers, αἰών did not sustain, among other meanings, a sense of *spirituality*, and if its import be not in many cases of a spiritual character, there is no meaning in words, and no significancy in language.

After reading over the foregoing instances, I turn to Professor Stuart's description of the meanings of αἰών in classical Greek, and contemplate its insufficiency with grief, and I had almost said, with dismay. *Αἰών*,' he says, 'means, (1) *Length* or *space of time*; and so, *time of life*, *age of man*, *age*, considered as a space of time. (2) *Long time*, *eternity*, *long indefinite space of time*.' — And this is all! Truly, there is no part of this definition that will answer to one half of the instances above produced; and these have been collected, as it were, by accident, from such few of the ancient classics as chanced to fall in my way, and as my accidental moments of leisure have allowed me to examine. How many more similar instances might be produced from other ancient Greek writings, I know not. But as these authors are among the acknowledged scholars of their times, it is most likely that correspondent modes of the use of αἰών might be discovered with equal frequency in other writers, should the inquiry be diligently and extensively prosecuted.

Take, for a single example, Hom. Il. v. 685.

Ἔπειτά με καὶ λίποι αἰών.

Endeavour to translate this according to Professor Stuart's definition, and mark the result; — 'Afterwards, let the *length* or *space of time*, the *time of life*, the *age of man*, the *age* considered as space of time, the *long time*, the *eternity*, the *long indefinite space of time*, the αἰών, in either of these meanings, forsake me.' The translation shows its absurdity

upon its face. And a similar absurdity appears whenever you attempt to apply Professor Stuart's definition to a great proportion of the instances above produced. They cannot be forced within the narrow borders of his description of the meanings of *αἰών*.

It is to be presumed, that Professor Stuart did not know of these modes of the usage of *αἰών* in these Greek writers; for, knowing them, he would never have contented himself with so incompetent a definition of this word, in a work which is evidently designed to be, and probably will be, a text-book for a numerous class of theological inquirers, for years to come.

It may be, however, that this presumption is wrong; and that, knowing these modes of the usage of this word, he is also acquainted with others, which countervail their testimony. If it be so, he will do a valuable service to inquirers by making them known. He is one deservedly honored for his talents, learning, station, and integrity; and his silence has power, as well as his assertion. He rules as a prince in an extensive spiritual realm. And I cannot but feel, that he is under an obligation to eternal truth, either to show how the instances of *αἰών* already produced, and others of a similar kind, can be fairly brought within the range of his definition; or, if this be impossible, to exhibit a new definition of the word, which will embrace these cases. For it is a word, on whose true meaning a doctrine of religion depends, embracing one of the most important principles of the Divine administration; the most momentous interests of the soul; and the entire character of the Christian Religion. It is one of those cases, in which 'a city that is set on a hill, cannot be hid.' And the trumpet of a watchman, on an elevated watch-tower in Zion, ought to utter a full, clear, and 'certain sound'; the distinct echoes of which he will be listening for, in the depths of the spirit, and will be glad to be hearing, in every region and every period, through all eternity. It is no spirit of vituperation which dictates this appeal; but an intense desire, that the sanction of so respected a name may not remain attached to this defective definition of a word, the right understanding of which is so essential to a right understanding of the Gospel of Christ.

I will at least indulge a hope, that Professor Stuart will examine the subject anew, before he allows himself to re-

peat, for the third time, that the exegesis in question is 'without any support at all from philology.'

After the foregoing exhibition of *αἰών* in ancient Greek, I may be justified in making the following assertions.

1. *Αἰών*, in the writers named, never signifies *eternity*.

2. The English word *existence* would express its meaning more generally than any other word in our language.

3. In very many instances it signifies *state*, or condition.

4. In some instances it signifies *period*.

5. In several instances its meaning is peculiarly of a *personal* character; referring to the *person*, or individual *being*.

6. In several instances it signifies the *principle* of *vitality*, the *soul*, the *spirit*.

I trust it will not be thought arrogant, if I now assume it as proved, that one meaning of *αἰών*, in ancient Greek, is *spirit*; and that, in a great proportion of its modes of usage, its import is of a spiritual character.

My witnesses in the case are before you. I have endeavoured to set them forth in such a manner, that they may be at any moment subjected to the severest cross-examination. Let them be so cross-examined. My main desire is, that they may be made to tell 'the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.' If, after sufficient examination, any of the asserted meanings of *αἰών* is found unsupported by them, I am quite content that such unsupported meaning should fall; so far as these evidences are necessary for maintaining it. And, on the other hand, one may be allowed to rest on such meanings in this word as are fairly sustained by competent testimony.

I have said nothing concerning the adjective *αἰώνιος*, for the single reason, that it does not occur in any instance in any of the Greek works within the present examination. Did I not know that it is to be found in Plato, I should be almost ready to believe, that it did not exist in *ancient* Greek at all. I have had no opportunity to consult the works of Plato to any extent, and can therefore say nothing of the frequency or infrequency with which this adjective occurs therein. But I will venture the present opinion, that *αἰώνιος* was *coined* by the early translators of the Pentateuch, as a proper representative of the adjective עולם, and is entirely of Hebrew-Greek origin. This opinion derives some sup-

port from the belief once current among the learned, and not yet wholly given up, that Plato was acquainted with the writings of Moses, and gathered many important ideas from them; so much so, that it has been said, 'Plato was only Moses speaking Greek.' It might thus be accounted for, that Plato should have used this adjective, while neither his predecessors nor contemporaries have done so. He found it perchance on the banks of the Nile, and transferred it to those of the Ilissus. But like any new-coined word, in any language, it was slowly received; and does not occur in his contemporaries or immediate successors; not even in Aristotle, his personal disciple. It is something so with Professor Stuart's favorite term 'exegesis'; a good, useful, and descriptive word, and acknowledged by our best lexicographers, and yet so unwillingly received, that, until he adopted it, it was hardly known among us to have ever entered into our language. Even now it has so much the character of a new-coined word, that it is but seldom employed by any one, save him who has brought it forward for use. It may become *current* English, in the course of time; and possibly some singular-minded inquirer, of some twenty centuries hence, may be forming conjectures as to the mode in which, and the person by whom, the ultimate and effectual transfer of this word was made from Athens to Andover.

In the entire absence of αἰώνιος from ancient Greek, within the present examination, it will not be thought unjustifiable to entertain the above opinion as to its origin, until further examination shall prove the opposite; and it must be presumed, that it follows the general track of αἰών, in its meanings and shades of meaning; with the exception of those meanings of a noun, which cannot be imparted to an adjective, and those which it is known this noun never did impart to this adjective.

In ancient Greek, ἀΐδιος is the most common term for expressing *eternal*. Instances, almost without number, occur in Aristotle. While, without pretending to know, further than I have examined, I can hazard but little in expressing a belief, that there are more instances of αἰώνιος in the Septuagint, perhaps in the Greek Pentateuch alone, than in all the Greek classics together, previous to the Christian era.

Αἰών, in ancient Greek, appears to have been much in the same condition as the word *existence* in English, which has

no true adjective formed from it, unless it be *existent*, which is more like a participle than an adjective, and falls far short of expressing that full relation to *existence* for which an adjective is wanted. Had we a word expressing the same relation to *existence* as *essential* does to *essence*, or *substantial* to *substance*, we should then have the proper term for expressing, in English, what *αἰώνιος* expresses in Greek, in the greater proportion of instances. Such an adjective, applied to an *enduring* existence, would signify much the same as *enduring;* to a *dispensational* existence, it would express *relation to the dispensation* contemplated; to a *spiritual* existence, it would express *relation to the spirit*, &c. Such I believe to be the state of things in regard to *αἰώνιος*. And when I read it, in association with a *spiritual* existence, I have no hesitation in receiving it as expressing the quality of *spirituality;* having reference to the mode of being, and the state and action of the thoughts, affections, and will of the subject; 'the inward action of mind,' within its own realm; which is the true LIFE or EXISTENCE of a spiritual being.

Referring once more to the noun, it is worthy of remark, how very little of the sense of *duration* appears in it in the foregoing instances. We have been in the habit of considering this word as relating, principally, if not entirely, to *duration* of some kind, either *temporary* or *eternal.* But if the preceding view be correct, *αἰών* very seldom contains the sense to duration at all. It refers to the conditions, associations, and various circumstances of *that* existence, which this word is at any time expressing; and the *endurance* is only one among the many things belonging to it. The adjective *αἰώνιος*, in such cases, signifies *relation to the existence in question*, with reference to its circumstances, conditions, and duration. Thus, for a single instance,—The Jewish *state* or *dispensation* was an EXISTENCE [*αἰών*] constituted by the Divine Being. He made a covenant with the patriarchs and their posterity, with reference to that particular EXISTENCE, (an *everlasting* covenant, as we read it in the English Bible;) but it was not *eternal*, for it has long since ceased. It was a covenant having reference to the *existence* then contemplated. He gave them the land of Canaan according to this covenant. He gave it to them not only as long as the EXISTENCE [*αἰών*] in question should continue, but also with reference to the *objects, conditions, circumstances, duties,*

privileges, and every thing associated with that *existence*. They should have the land to possess, inhabit, use, and enjoy, with reference to the *form of government*, *worship*, *discipline*, *divine communications*, the *law*, the *promises*, 'the *adoption*, the *glory*,' 'the *service of God*,' the *coming of the Messiah*, the *dealings of providence and grace*, and all things belonging to that *existence*, *state*, or *condition of things*, which we call the *Jewish dispensation*. When that *existence* [*αἰὼν*] ceased, this associated covenant ceased with it.

This view of the meaning of *αἰὼν* and *αἰώνιος* might be illustrated by the very familiar examples of *corporations*, *families*, *habits of the public mind*, *individuals*, *communities*, *nations*, &c., each of which is an *existence* [*αἰὼν*] in its own way; and a large community comprehending several minor ones, like our own nation comprehending several distinct states, may justly be called an *existence of existences* [*αἰὼν τῶν αἰώνων*]. Indeed, I see not why this name is not peculiarly appropriate to an *institution* of wide influence, like that of Andover, embracing within this influence many minor existences, and infusing into them its knowledge, habits, and spirit, as they float within its embracing sphere. It is an EXISTENCE, at least, if not an *existence of existences*. An adjective corresponding to *αἰώνιος*, employed with respect to either of these, would express relation to the particular existence contemplated. So likewise the human soul is an *existence*, a spiritual one; and an adjective describing what takes place within the soul, as the happiness or misery consequent upon a judgment, would signify *spiritual*, the peculiar quality of the *existence* to which the happiness or misery refers. But as there is no particular sense of *duration* belonging to the term *existence*, in these cases, so neither is there belonging to *αἰὼν* in ancient Greek, so far as the present inquiry affords evidence. I cannot now pursue the illustration farther. But if the main idea, herein advanced, can be supported, it opens an interesting field of inquiry, and for the illustration of the Scriptures.

Be this as it may, it is certain that the Seventy considered *αἰὼν* as the *equivalent* of עולם, with due regard to the difference of idiom between the Greek and the Hebrew. We must, therefore, seek for their understanding of the Hebrew word, in the meaning of the Greek word in their age. The preceding exhibition of the habits of *αἰὼν* may do what it

can towards elucidating their views. The question of the *extent* of coincidence between the two terms in Scriptural usage, can also be further tried by an appeal to ancient Hebrew, and a more extensive search in ancient Greek. My limits will not admit a discussion of the Hebrew term. But I must needs remark, that Professor Stuart's assertion, that the meanings of *secrecy*, something *hidden*, &c., 'belong exclusively to the *verb* עלם, and not to the noun עולם,' is not at all correct. These meanings are as fully maintained by good authority in the *noun*, as they are in the *verb*. It therefore is not I who have, as he says, 'committed a radical error,' in my 'philological reasoning'; but it is Professor Stuart, who has affirmed concerning the word in question, what is contrary to the truth, if *etymology*, *lexicography*, and *usage*, are sufficient evidences of the truth. It is ill disputing facts with Professor Stuart. But when, with so much self-complacency, he charges me with so coarse a blunder, he must not count it uncourteous, if I defend myself against his condemnation, although by a contradiction of his declarations; being supported in so doing by competent authorities, to some of which he himself, in his writings, has referred me, and which shall be produced, if they are called for.

Nor will he deem it uncourteous, or an admission of the conclusiveness of his arguments, if I pass by for the present, if not for ever, other statements in his 'Appendix,' which may seem to require notice. Least of all, will he probably expect a reply to so *philological* and *exegetical* an argument for the meaning of *eternal*, in αἰώνιος, as this,—'It is well, indeed, that the public should know how far they will be required to go, in order to get rid of the argument, to prove that αἰώνιος means *eternal*. I thank the writer in question for telling them this secret.'

But as to a sense of *spirituality* in the Greek αἰών, both *etymology*, *lexicography*, and certain *usage* prove this meaning, among others, to have existed in this word in the age of the Seventy; and it is inconceivable, that they should have so uniformly employed it for translating עולם, unless they perceived a similar sense in the Hebrew term. Their employing αἰών as the equivalent of עולם, is proof sufficient, that they did not consider the Hebrew word to signify positive *eternity*, and that they did consider it to signify, among other things,

spirituality. And as to the assertion of Professor Stuart, that 'it cannot be shown that any words are *so appropriate* to the object named,' that is, of expressing *eternity*, 'as αἰὼν and αἰώνιος,' I must take leave respectfully, but plainly, to contradict it entirely. It can hardly be shown, that any words could be *less* appropriate to this object than these, which *never* expressed *eternity* in their native tongue; if the present investigation exhibits a fair view of the habits of the one, and the comparative non-existence of the other.

Should it also prove correct, as Professor Stuart suggests with allusion to Tittman, that the Gnostic system did not exist until after the advent of the Messiah, then the very circumstance, that the Gnostics employed αἰὼν to represent a *spiritual* being [Æon], would be an additional evidence, that *spirit* was the ancient, if not the original meaning of this word. It is no uncommon thing for philosophers, when inventing a new system of philosophy, to recur to first principles in the meaning of words, in order to form a proper vocabulary for that system; contrariwise, it is exceedingly common. To this principle we are indebted for most of the technical names employed in every system of philosophy; and to this, in particular, are we indebted for the precise, descriptive, and it may be added, beautiful nomenclature of modern chemistry. On this principle, the Gnostic use of αἰὼν, to represent an incorporeal or *spiritual* existence, would be only a reviving of its ancient meaning; a restoration of the word to its original sense, after the varieties of signification, which, in the lapse of ages, it must have contracted, by reason of its different uses by different individual writers in different generations.

On the supposition, therefore, that the Gnostic system arose at the late period suggested by Professor Stuart, as above, we have an additional reason for believing, that in the more ancient days of the Seventy, the sense of *spirituality* still remained in αἰὼν: and that the word was employed in this sense in the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures.

I dated my former communications, and subscribed them with so much of my name as might enable any one, who desired it, to identify the author; because I know that many of my opinions are widely different from those of Unitarians, in general, and of the conductors of the Examiner, in par-

ticular; and I was not willing to burden them with any part of a responsibility, which I ought to sustain alone. I do the same now, with the same intention; and I hereby protest against the employment of any thing coming from me, as evidence of the opinions of any one else, or of any sect, party, or body of men. I hold myself alone responsible for whatever is above asserted.

Yours, in true good will,

E. S. G.

Sandwich, Jan. 1, 1831.

ART. IV. — 1. *An Address on the Expediency and Duty of adopting the Bible as a Class-Book, in every Scheme of Education, from the Primary School to the University. Delivered at Columbia, South Carolina, December* 4, 1829, *before the Richland School.* By THOMAS S. GRIMKÉ. Charleston. 8vo.

2. *An Oration on the Advantages to be derived from the Introduction of the Bible and of Sacred Literature, as Essential Parts of all Education, in a Literary Point of View merely, from the Primary School to the University. Delivered before the Connecticut Alpha of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, September* 7, 1830. By THOMAS S. GRIMKÉ, of Charleston, S. C. New Haven, Hezekiah Howe. 1830. 8vo.

'EVERY man has his hobby,' is a homely saying, but a very true one. From the great reformer of national constitutions, down to the author of the last improvement upon Murray's Grammar, every man has a way of his own, to hasten the march of mind towards the goal of perfection. If we are to believe these gentlemen, it is only necessary to adopt their plans to remove all the ills that flesh and spirit are heirs to; and it is because we belong to an obstinate and stiff-necked generation, that our condition has not been raised to an extraordinary degree of elevation long since. One of them declaims vehemently against the anomalies of English orthography,

which he forthwith sets himself about correcting, but finds, to his astonishment and indignation, that the world positively reject his sagacious reforms, and continue blindly to spell as their fathers spelt before them. Another pours out the phials of his wrath upon an unoffending part of speech in English grammar, against which he buckles on his armour, and wages an exterminating warfare. Another, as was lately done by a village pedagogue in the West, with that modesty which sits so gracefully on the brow of retiring merit, informs the public, that, a single book excepted, no work since the dispersion at Babel has been written with grammatical accuracy; and, in his philanthropic zeal for the cause of correct parsing, proposes a plan of reform in universal literature.

This propensity admits of an easy and natural explanation. Individuals, led either by accident, or by an instinctive determination of their minds, to certain particular pursuits, come to regard them as of supreme importance, not to themselves alone, but to every body else. A man who has directed his thoughts many years to one point exclusively, is quite naturally persuaded, that all other men, who estimate his favorite object at a somewhat lower rate than he does, are blind and bigoted. 'Strange,' he exclaims, 'that such gross delusions have overspread the world. The evils, which have resulted from this state of ignorance and prejudice, are incalculable. Untold treasures have been wasted, and rivers of blood needlessly lavished, to sustain a system of error and folly, which the principles *I* have discovered, if wisely applied, might have saved.' After having exaggerated ten-fold the evils actually suffered, and a hundred-fold the efficacy of his proposed remedies, he stares in amazement at the stupidity of the incredulous public, abuses the age in which he lives, and finally commits his fame, like Galileo in the prison of the Inquisition, to a later and more enlightened generation.

We have been led into this train of remarks by the perusal of the two discourses, which we have named at the head of this article. We certainly do not intend to apply them all to Mr. Grimké, and yet they certainly are applicable to him in some degree. That gentleman's honesty of purpose, ardent zeal for the good of mankind, and high religious feeling, command, as they deserve, our sincere respect; but we must not permit our respect for the character and attainments of the man, to blind us to the visionary and impracticable nature of the

scheme he so zealously, and, as we think, injudiciously advocates. It is the easiest thing in the world, in the speculative retirement of the closet, to conjure up a host of terrible abuses, partly real and partly imaginary, and then to conjure them down again, as by the waving of an enchanter's wand. But in practical life, alas! the visions of the closet are dissipated; imagination finds no prototypes to its fantastic creations; and the Utopian schemes of the speculator, amidst the wear and tear of the world, are mercilessly scattered to the winds of heaven.

Our objections to Mr. Grimké's discourses are against both the manner and the matter. Reserving our strictures upon the scheme, which he partially unfolds, for another portion of this article, we propose, in the first place, to consider them merely as literary productions. We have rarely met with writings from the pen of a literary and accomplished gentleman, ushered into the world with such high-sounding pretensions, which were marred by more numerous or more glaring faults. Mr. Grimké indulges in a style of writing, the pomp and parade of which are entirely overwhelming. The longest and ofttimes the weakest words are selected; the most common-place thoughts are marshalled under the gaudy trappings of sentences stiff with gorgeous adjectives, and manœuvred through all the evolutions of rhetorical tactics. Illustrations are drawn from the 'vasty deep' of many years given to multifarious reading, and made to perform a round of duties for which they are utterly unfit. Simplicity, brevity, and force of style are constant topics of praise with our author, and yet scarce a paragraph can be selected from both discourses, amounting in all to more than one hundred and fifty pages, which does not set at nought all three; as if the orator's main object were to show by contrast how important these qualities of an elegant style ought to be deemed. He is constantly declaiming against the influence of Grecian and Roman classics; and yet never omits an opportunity of dragging in a classical illustration, which illustrates nothing but the author's loose and random habits of association, and a quotation, which proves nothing but his acquaintance with the classic tongues. We have quotations in Greek, in Latin, in French, in Spanish, in Italian. Now, who, in the name of common sense, ever heard of a man's quoting, before a miscellaneous audience, from half a dozen foreign

languages in the originals? What name can we give to such a practice, but that of arrant pedantry? Classical allusions may frequently be used with great beauty and effect; but the point must be clear and the analogy obvious to the well read scholar, or the allusion mars the force of the thought, however splendid and imposing. The folly of crowding our pages with foreign names, and phrases from the ancient languages, is deserving of the severest reprehension, for it indicates a great depravity of taste. Our own noble language is sufficiently comprehensive to embrace within its grasp any subject, however mighty. Why then interlard our conversation and our writings with scraps collected from a superficial acquaintance with foreign literature? Why imitate the absurdity of second-rate British novelists, and American *ultra* fashionables, by tacking upon the homespun garments of our excellent English, the gilded fopperies, the 'purple patches,' imported from abroad? If a writer is very anxious to let the public into the secret of his marvellous acquaintance with the tongues, instead of puzzling an American audience with strange-sounding words, he should indite a modest little note, or preface, in which the public may be duly informed on that interesting matter. But nothing can palliate the absurdity of which a public speaker is guilty, who addresses a common literary assembly in a dialect like that of Babel, made up of all the languages, which he may chance to have studied in the course of his academic or professional life; and we can think of no more appropriate punishment, than a general dispersion like the dispersion of old, leaving the oratorical polyglot to harangue the deserted walls. We need scarcely remind Mr. Grimké of what St. Paul says concerning the barbarism of using strange tongues, before those who do not understand them.

Another fault is the looseness and vagueness of the reasoning, or rather the entire substitution of declamation, assertion, and inapplicable illustration, for a train of argument tending to prove the propositions, which are the main topics of his discourses. We take it for granted, that a writer who assumes to himself the authority to pass a sentence of severe condemnation upon any system whatever, should found his judgment upon an array of well authenticated facts, carefully sifted, and brought together in a clear and logical order, so as to justify, by the strictest reasoning, the inferences which

he wishes to establish. If he fail to do this, his opinion will have the air of emanating from the heated mind of the partizan, and not from the cool and candid deliberations of the single-hearted inquirer after truth. If he propose to erect a new system amidst the ruins of one which he has shaken to the earth, he must state forcibly and convincingly the reasons why, and the manner how, this new system is to be established. But if, in order to show the justice of his sweeping denunciation against the present order of things, he is driven to exaggerate trifles into matters of importance; to state the bad tendencies which might possibly belong to the system in question under certain supposable circumstances, as enormous evils actually disturbing the welfare of society, and crying out for reform; to drag up abuses from the depths of past ages, where they have slumbered in undisturbed repose, and fasten them upon an order of things with which they have no legitimate connexion; and if, in the second place, he cannot define precisely the plan which he zealously maintains; if he substitutes common-places and empty superlatives for the strong points which a man, who has deeply meditated upon his subject, and brought it clearly and completely within his grasp, never fails to present; if he leaves out certain preliminaries, which remaining unsettled, we are in the dark as to the direction in which the very first step for carrying into execution his reform, is to be taken; — then we cannot choose but pause before admitting his claim to the rank of a profound philosopher, a luminous thinker, a great discoverer. This is precisely the case with Mr. Grimké. He seems to have formed his theory, and then sought his facts. His ardent imagination, unrestrained by an extensive and impartial survey of things as they actually are, paints to him in vivid colors a multitude of evils which never existed, and never could exist. The imperfections which grow out of every condition in which imperfect beings like men can be placed, he magnifies into abuses, which call for the steady nerve and unshrinking arm of some great reformer to correct. A tone of exaggeration runs through his discourses, which draws no response from the mind of the impartial reader. The influence of classical learning upon the mind, the character, and the heart, is represented in startling and terrific descriptions, for which the lives and characters and opinions of the noblest classical scholars furnish no corresponding commentary. We should

suppose, that Mr. Grimké had adopted the germs of his present opinions in early life, and nurtured them with every possible kind of sustenance, which the observation of succeeding years could furnish; carefully avoiding every thing that might check or destroy their growth; until they have at length attained to such a height as to absorb all the intellectual nutriment his mind can supply. His argument carries on the face of it marks of its unsoundness.

In casting our eyes along the pages of these discourses, we meet with italicized passages in almost every paragraph. It may seem rather captious to find fault with a practice apparently so innocent. We object to it, however, not because it occurs so frequently in the writings of Mr. Grimké, but on general principles. We have often been offended with the consciousness which authors manifest, of the importance of their opinions and the smartness of their sayings, by making them prominent in this emphatic way; but it is especially ridiculous when the opinions and sayings, thus singled out for a distinction above their fellows, are of an ordinary character, and nowise entitled to the author's or the reader's peculiar approbation. It seems too much like intimating a doubt of the reader's sagacity, and kindly proffering to aid him in admiring, melting, sorrowing, laughing, &c. in the proper place. Now we think it quite as well for the writer's reputation, and a great deal better for the reader's satisfaction, to let this matter take care of itself. There is altogether too much of stage-trick in it for the calm and dignified manner in which literary and philosophical topics ought to be discussed. It resembles the 'hands' by which the attention of the public is significantly directed to the advertisements of Relfe's 'asthmatic pills,' or 'the most ancient distiller's *incomparable eau de Cologne.*'

We have space only for a few extracts to illustrate what we have said of Mr. Grimké's manner. After some exceedingly exaggerated remarks on the ascendency of classical learning in our systems of education, he qualifies his denunciations as follows;

'We are not the enemies of the cultivation of classical learning, at a suitable age, in an appropriate place, and by those who will receive profit without injury. Like Petrarch's father, we would not in our wrath hurl the classics of our sons into the fire. Like Cheynell, when he flung the detested book

of Chillingworth into his grave, we would not bury them in our anger. Like Watteau, when he shrunk on his death-bed from the miserably painted crucifix; like the dying Menage, when he rebuked the bad French of his attendant, we would not carry the fastidiousness of Christian taste so far, as to banish from all education the poet or the orator, the philosopher or the historian of antiquity.' — *Oration*, p. 36.

Here is a thought of the most ordinary character, illustrated by four examples drawn from literary history, and put forth as analogous. The first of these examples is exactly a case in point; the second is tolerable; but the last two not only fail to illustrate the author's meaning, but are so dissimilar, that none of the common laws of association could have suggested them. Many such passages might be adduced, but a single specimen is sufficient for our purpose. The author's memory is evidently stored with a vast variety of literary and historical facts; but he has none of that mysterious power which detects hidden analogies amongst the objects of knowledge, binds them together by the indestructible links of philosophic association, and draws with certainty and effect upon the mind's accumulated stores for the materials of apt and powerful illustration.

The main idea of the following passage is an excellent one, and if stated simply, would excite the mind of the patriotic American student to serious reflection on a most important subject. Let us see how Mr. Grimké presents it.

'If indeed we desire to behold a literature like that which has sculptured with such energy of expression, which has painted so faithfully and vividly the crimes, the vices, the follies of ancient and modern Europe; if we desire that our land should furnish for the orator and the novelist, for the painter and the poet, age after age, the wild and romantic scenery of war; the glittering march of armies, and the revelry of the camp; the shrieks and blasphemies, and all the horrors of the battle field; the desolation of the harvest, and the burning cottage; the storm, the sack, and the ruin of cities; if we desire to unchain the furious passions of jealousy and selfishness, of hatred and ambition, those lions that now sleep harmless in their dens; if we desire that the lake, the river, the ocean, should blush with the blood of brothers; that the winds should waft from the land to the sea, from the sea to the land, the roar and the smoke of battle; that the very mountain-tops should become altars for the sacrifice of brothers; if we desire

that these, and such as these, the elements to an incredible extent of the literature of the old world, should be the elements of our literature, then, but then only, let us hurl from its pedestal the majestic statue of our union, and scatter its fragments over all our land. But if we covet for our country the noblest, purest, loveliest literature the world has ever seen, such a literature as shall honor God and bless mankind; a literature whose smiles might play upon an angel's face, whose tears "would not stain an angel's cheek," then let us cling to the union of these states, with a patriot's love, with a scholar's enthusiasm, with a Christian's hope. In her heavenly character, as a holocaust self-sacrificed to God; at the height of her glory, as the ornament of a free, educated, peaceful, and Christian people, American literature will find that the intellectual spirit is her very tree of life, and that union her garden of Paradise.' — *Oration*, pp. 53, 54.

Such is the peroration to Mr. Grimké's second discourse. A more extraordinary outpouring of long words, heavy clauses, incongruous figures, and strange *prosopopœias*, it would be difficult to select from the whole circle of ephemeral literature. What sort of a being is this personification of Literature? and what are the 'smiles' of a literature that might play upon an angel's face? and what are the 'tears of a literature' that 'would not stain an angel's cheek?' How is the hurling of a majestic statue from its pedestal, to unchain 'those lions, that now sleep harmless in their dens'? And how is the 'hurling of the statue from its pedestal' going to make the unchaining of lions an element of our national literature? We object to this forced and unnatural inflation of style, by which a single thought, with the aid of battles, sacrifices, 'the pomp and circumstance of glorious war,' lions, statues, and pedestals, is strained over a whole page of sonorous declamation.

We agree with Mr. Grimké in our estimate of the surpassing beauties of sacred literature. The genius of Hebrew poetry soars with a stronger wing and to a more lofty height, than the noblest efforts of the Muses of Parnassus. Considered merely as literary productions, they stand apart from the other creations of intellect, and are worthy to be treasured up in the 'holy of holies' of the human heart. But we cannot yield our assent to the highly colored statements of the neglect into which they have fallen, and of the comparative ascendency permitted to the Greek and Roman classics in our

schools, with which both of these discourses abound. Assertions like the following are to be found in almost every page, and our remarks upon this short extract will apply to many others of a similar character. After speaking of the sublimity of the sacred classics, he proceeds thus;

'Such is the best of classics the world has ever admired; such the noblest that man has ever adopted as a guide. And yet, incredible as it may seem, and to all but ourselves it would be incredible, this best, this noblest classic, is excluded from all our places of education, with a watchfulness, a zeal, a perseverance, worthy of the enemies, but dishonorable to the friends, of the Bible. Had the infidel constructed the schemes of education, which prevail in Christian countries, we should not be surprised to find them such as they are; for they exclude as much of Scriptural elements, as even a politic infidel would venture to omit; whilst they embrace as ample a share of the constituents of Paganism and of the world, as an infidel could dare to employ, with the hidden purpose of depraving the heart, corrupting the moral taste, and keeping religion and the Scriptures constantly out of view. I know that the good and the great, the wise and the learned, and not the infidel, have been the founders, and are the supporters, of these schemes. I know that even the Christian ministry, in every variety of virtue and knowledge, under all the vicissitudes of wealth and poverty, of glory and obscurity, have honored them with their sanction, and sustained them by their influence.'—*Address*, pp. 7, 8.

Such declarations, coming from a learned and accomplished man, fill us with amazement. In what portion of these United States Mr. Grimké collected the facts, which ought to be the basis of statements so vehemently urged, we cannot imagine. Is it indeed true, that the holy records of our religion are as carefully shut out from our schemes of education, as an infidel, with the treacherous purpose 'of depraving the heart and corrupting the moral taste,' would shut them out? If it is so, then indeed is the time come when all, to whom religion and morals are dear, should cry aloud and spare not, until these monstrous schemes are banished for ever from the land. But how, we would ask, does it happen, that every year more copies of the Scriptures are disposed of than of all other books together? how does it happen, that the price of the Bible is so small that the poorest laborer among us, may purchase a handsome copy with the wages of a single day?

Let a few facts answer. Education, in our happy country, is preëminently imbued with the spirit of religion. The first accents of maternal tenderness are uttered in the pious work of impressing upon the infant mind the principles of Christian duty. The mild precepts, the softening power, the affecting simplicity of the religion of Jesus, are indissolubly blended with the dearest associations, and the most touching reminiscences of childhood and youth. As we leave the paternal abode, we enter upon a new stage of education, where the Bible is always regarded as the 'standard of usefulness and duty.' The simple and captivating histories of the patriarchs, the wondrous adventures of God's chosen people, the artless narrations of the evangelists, and, above all, the heavenly doctrines of him 'who spoke as never man spoke,' are as familiar to us as the 'voices of our homes.' The Testament is the commonest school-book in the United States. 'So far from forming our character under pagan auspices, every scheme of ethics, every moral sentiment in literature, is brought to the test of a comparison with the moral and religious system of the Scriptures. For admission into every college, we believe, throughout the country, the Greek Testament is required. In some of our colleges, a critical examination and comparison of the Scriptures with each other, constitute a part of academic education. Learned professors lecture to the upper classes on the criticism and *bibliography* of the Scriptures. The Evidences of Christianity are zealously and elaborately taught. Add to this, the morning and evening devotions, the reading of the Scriptures, and the stated services of the Sabbath; the influence of public sentiment, and the general interest in subjects of a religious nature that pervades every circle of society; and we have, altogether, an array of influences in favor of Christianity, in the first place as a 'standard of usefulness and duty,' and in the second place, as an object of curious inquiry and liberal investigation, which it would be difficult to parallel from any department of merely human learning. Can this be a system of education, 'which we should not be surprised to find,' had the infidel 'constructed it'? Does this 'exclude as much of Scriptural elements, as a politic infidel would venture to omit'? And is this the mode which a plotting infidel would adopt to accomplish his nefarious purpose of 'corrupting the moral taste, and keeping religion and the

Scriptures constantly out of view'? Where it is considered disgraceful to the lowliest tiller of the soil to be without his Bible, can it possibly be true, that 'the Bible is actually placed under the ban of outlawry, in all systems of instruction'? These facts, to say the least, are at the widest possible remove from confirming Mr. Grimké's glowing declamation. If the final issue of our education is not the formation of a truly Christian character, the fault is not chargeable upon our ignorance of the Scriptures, or the negligent manner in which religious and moral duty has been urged upon us, from childhood to manhood; by our mothers' lips, by the instructers of our boyhood, by the professors who guided the studies of our maturer years. We must look to other causes, widely different from these; to the facility with which the human heart yields to the manifold temptations which beset it; to the gradual slackening of that firmness of moral principle, in the progress of which many of us are seduced from the paths of virtue; 'magis magisque lapsi sint; tum ire cœperint præcipites; donec ad hæc tempora, quibus nec vitia nostra, nec remedia pati possumus, perventum est.'

We were surprised to meet with sneers, illiberal, as we think, and undeserved, upon the labors of those meritorious scholars, who have applied themselves to the correction of the text, and the illustration of the sense, of the classics, particularly the editions '*in usum Delphini*'; as if the labors of all men of learning ought to be devoted to the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures; and as if these latter had been neglected, in the great attention paid to the former. Has Mr. Grimké forgotten the profoundly learned labors and researches of Buxtorf and Glass, Storr, Jahn, Vater, and most especially the unrivalled Gesenius, in the department of Hebrew philology and grammar? Has he forgotten the laborious minuteness, the wonderful sagacity, the varied erudition of Athias, Leusden, Van Der Hooght, and De Rossi? Does he not know, that these mighty moderns, having received the Hebrew Scriptures from the careful hands of Jewish copyists, have compared manuscripts, scrutinized 'various readings,' and expended lavishly from their exhaustless treasures of sacred learning, until we are in possession of a Hebrew text, more elaborately correct by many degrees, than the best preserved of the Grecian and Roman classics? Does he not know, that the text of the Greek Testament, as revised by Griesbach, is the result

of indefatigable labors, which have been employed to establish the genuine reading of the Christian Scriptures, by the canons of the most refined criticism, supported by manifold comparisons, careful inductions, extensive research? So much for the neglect of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures manifested by learned men.

We now proceed to the second class of objections against these two discourses; we mean our objections to the plan, which the orator has vaguely sketched, rather than clearly unfolded. He frequently presses the importance of making the Bible a text-book, not only for duty, but for the cultivation of literary taste, from the primary school to the University, to the exclusion in a measure of Greek and Roman classics. That the Bible ought to be the standard of *duty*, we most reverently believe; but that it should be made a text-book of literary studies, to such an extent as Mr. Grimké proposes, we believe to be neither desirable nor possible. In what mode this reform is to be accomplished, Mr. Grimké has not explained. We presume, from a hint casually thrown out in one of his notes, that he would not have the Hebrew introduced, in place of Greek and Latin, into all our schools. It remains, then, to put into the hands of boys and young men translations of the Scriptures, to be studied with a view to the cultivation of literary taste. A serious objection to this mode of proceeding, would be the wearisome repetition of the same dull drilling, and the consequent irreverent and almost contemptuous familiarity, which boys would acquire in regard to the Scriptures. If we reflect a moment upon the nature of the plan proposed, by which, in addition to the time now given to the perusal of the Bible, from the first to the last stages of education, every student is to be confined the greater part of his time to the same works, with all the imperfections of a translation upon them, can we anticipate any result short of unconquerable aversion and disgust? Let us think deeply before we expose our sacred books to this unhappy catastrophe of a rash innovation in the range of academic and collegiate studies.

Again we ask, how is this reform to be accomplished? In what manner are schoolboys and young collegians to be instructed in sacred literature, by means of translations? Are they to commit them to memory? That is already a very common thing. Are they to spend their hours and months

and years in reading them over and over again? That would be only a wearisome extension of the present plan. Are they to be taught the higher philosophy of Jewish literature? That is utterly beyond their reach. The ripened intellect of manhood can alone grasp the spirit, and discern the fine philosophy, clothed in the visible symbols of a national literature; and even then a long course of literary culture is necessary to prepare the mind for this curious and subtile process. Are they to be put to the study of the Hebrew tongue? This does not come within the scope of the proposed innovation, though the more general study of that venerable dialect is contemplated as one of its remote results. We are compelled to believe, until Mr. Grimké shall inform us of a definite method, that his system, carried to its full extent, is utterly impracticable. But apart from these, are other, and as we think, weighty objections.

1. *In the character and situation of the Jews.* The situation of this singular people was such as no other nation was ever placed in. Selected by Jehovah, in the persons of their patriarchal ancestors, to be the depositaries of his revelations to man, they were at once placed in relations of a very peculiar character to the rest of the world. As they felt that they were special objects of divine protection, their arms were nerved, and their hearts were braced, with a courage that never wavered. Guided by inspired men, instructed, warned, protected, by a series of splendid miracles, from the time of their departure from Egypt to their establishment in the land of Canaan, no wonder that they acquired moral and intellectual peculiarities of character, which form a broad distinction between them and all other nations of the earth. National literature is the embodying of national character in written records. It is easy therefore to perceive, that the literature of such a nation as the Hebrews can have but little in common with other ancient or modern literatures. Add to this, the inspiration of prophets and seers, whose sublime productions form a large proportion of the Bible, and we have a barrier still more impassable, between the Jews and ourselves. That awful communion between the spirit of God and the spirit of man, guided by which the rapt prophet stepped upon the untrodden shores of the Future, and gazed, in phrenzied vision, upon the phantom forms of coming events, and poured out the conceptions of his soul in descrip-

tions adorned by all the magnificent imagery that arose at the bidding of inspiration, — that communion has ceased for ever. The results we have in the prophetic portions of the Hebrew Scriptures. They present a rich and delightful field of study for the philosopher and the Christian; but do they offer fitting materials for the cultivation of literary taste in common literary education? Do the literary remains of a nation so different in character, in situation, in every circumstance that contributes to the formation and developement of intellect, furnish a well adapted instrument for the formation and developement of intellect among us?

2. *The Hebrew language can never constitute a portion of common literary education.* This ancient and peculiar tongue, apart from its claims upon our attention as the vehicle employed by the sacred penmen to communicate to the world the messages of inspiration, presents a curious object of study to the lover of philological pursuits. It is the oldest language, probably, of which we have any authentic records. It bears every internal mark of being strictly an original, a primitive language. Its vocabulary is limited, but at the same time it seems wonderfully adapted to the purposes of simple narration, lyric poetry, and the sublimest flights of oriental and inspired imagination. The strength and living glow of its expressions have been the admiration of scholars, and have set at defiance, in the intensely animated pictures they present, the periphrastic coldness of modern tongues. It seems to be the personification of the living spirit of man, under the most peculiar and exciting influences. But it has little or nothing in common with the principles on which all modern languages are constructed. A knowledge of it, therefore, throws but little or at least a dubious light on the philosophy of the dialects used at the present day. Hebrew belongs to a class of languages entirely distinct from the languages of Christendom. It is the key which unlocks the treasures accumulated in such abundance by oriental genius in the kindred languages of Persia and Arabia. As such, it must ever be an object of deep and lasting interest to the linguist who has the taste and leisure to prosecute his philological researches beyond the literary barriers of Christendom. But the smattering of Hebrew, which, in nine cases out of ten, is the only knowledge of this venerable tongue possessed even by students in theology — called in the academic phrase,

just enough to dig out a hard passage with a grammar and lexicon — is scarcely worth the labor of a single hour. But simple as the language is, limited as is its vocabulary, the difficulty of acquiring it is incomparably greater than that of acquiring any, even the most copious of the European stock. The omission, to a very great extent, of vowels in the alphabetic writing, which is common to Hebrew and its younger sister-dialects, and the supplying of this omission by an elaborate system of Rabbinical points, which has been found absolutely necessary to Western scholars, render the study of Hebrew an intricate and laborious, but at the same time a most interesting pursuit to the student who can command the leisure to prosecute it with a good degree of philosophical accuracy. To the schoolboy, and the student in the earlier stages of his literary education, the first sight of the learned grammatical works of such a man as Professor Gesenius of Halle, would be utterly disheartening. We think, therefore, that the Hebrew, from its dissimilarity to modern European tongues; from the narrow circle of its vocabulary, embracing the philosophical expressions for no single department in literature or science; from the difficulty, and the learned and laborious research necessary to its acquisition; from the little influence it has exerted, in the nature of things, upon modern culture, can never, under any circumstances, become a part of elementary education. Will any one pretend, that a literary taste can be formed on Hebrew models, without a knowledge of the Hebrew language?

3. *The English Translation of the Bible can never be used as a text-book to the extent proposed by Mr. Grimké.* The Bible, in the version of King James, as every one knows, is a very common school-book. Its contents are familiar to every child among us. That it might be used with much better effect than it now is, we fully admit. Too much attention is paid to the mere literal contents of the chapters and verses, and not enough to the explanations of peculiar thoughts by the peculiar geographical, historical, or political facts, in which such thoughts originated. A reform in this respect, we heartily agree, ought to be attempted by the instructers of youth. But, we would ask, How can the literary taste of students in academies and Universities be formed by the study of an English Translation, which was executed so long ago, that it wears the venerable air of an almost obsolete

form of our language, with many imperfections confessedly upon its pages, and which is after all but a faint reflection of the spirit of a most peculiar people? It may be said the answer to this question is contained in the following remarks of Mr. Grimké.

'There is one point of view in which we love to contemplate the Scriptures, and to us at least, it is new. We regard them as furnishing the desideratum of the critic, so anxiously, and hitherto so vainly, sought, THE STANDARD OF TASTE; *because they are the only standard of immortal, all-pervading, immutable* THOUGHT. Thought is the only fountain of taste, the only parent of style. To cultivate the taste and style, as though they were independent of thought, is too much the error of our schemes of literary education; and it has arisen to a vast extent, from that idolatrous admiration of the classics, so happily reproved by Perrault;

'"La docte antiquité fut toujours vénérable,
Je ne la trouve pas cependant adorable."'

Oration, pp. 18, 19.

The idea in this passage seems, from its emphatic repetitions, to be a favorite one with the author. It is chargeable, however, with the same indistinctness and false reasoning, that so often tarnish his pages. That 'idolatrous admiration of the classics,' if reproved at all, should have been reproved by something better than a pointless and insipid couplet of French Alexandrines. In what manner are the Scriptures to be considered, 'in a literary point of view,' a standard of thought and taste? *How* is modern thought to be measured and tried by this standard? What is the meaning of that vague generality, 'thought is the only fountain of taste'? *When*, *how*, and *where*, are taste and style cultivated as though they were independent of thought? Considered merely as human works, the Hebrew writings were produced under such a peculiar combination of circumstances, that modern productions never can and never will be judged of by Jewish canons. No critic would have the hardihood to attempt it; no author would be guilty of the absurdity of submitting to it. The sublime poetry of the Hebrew muse is rich in magnificent descriptions of nature, and beautiful effusions of that sentiment of admiration for the Creator's works, which the devout and accomplished mind always experiences in contemplating them; but these

descriptions are founded on oriental nature, and this sentiment is modified by oriental habits of living, thinking, writing, and acting; all of which are so different from modern and western influences, that it seems to us impossible to bring the sentiments and thoughts of modern poetry to the standard of corresponding productions in Jewish literature. Again, what is *style*? Nothing else, surely, than the mode of expressing thought. The idea of cultivating style, as entirely independent of thought, involves a contradiction; for style, independent of thought, cannot exist at all. Is it possible for style to be cultivated too much? Can a writer or a speaker be too anxious in his efforts to express himself with force, elegance, distinctness, and, above all, with logical correctness? We think not; and the two discourses before us are a negative proof that our opinion is just. As to 'that idolatrous admiration of the classics so happily reproved by Perrault,' Mr. Grimké has evidently overrated it. When the Greek and Roman classics were the only standards of literary taste, that is, when no other literary works existed, it was necessary that men should consider them the only lawful authorities in the decision of literary disputes, for the simple reason, that they *were*, in point of fact, the only authorities. Is it so now? Do we look to the principles of the Grecian critics, to Longinus, to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, to Aristotle, and approve or disapprove of literary works, according as they coincide with, or diverge from the dogmas of these illustrious men? Certainly not. We do not now ask, whether an epic or drama is fashioned according to the prescription of the Stagirite; whether it has a beginning, a middle, and an end, before we presume to be pleased with it. But if it be true to the feelings of our nature, if it come home to the heart, we yield ourselves to our author's power, 'we know not why, we care not wherefore.' Though English scholars have studied more deeply the spirit of antiquity than the literary men of any other European nation, the Germans of the last half-century alone excepted, yet English literature, taken in a body, is the freest, richest, most original literature, that has adorned the intellectual history of man. In France, the last strong hold of the falsely called Classical school, the restrictive system, particularly in the drama, which was established by the precepts and example of a few bigoted admirers of scholastic proprieties and the unities, and which caused a cold

and heartless species of pompous declamation, a poor attempt at mimicking the lofty spirit of Grecian tragedy, to be substituted for the expression of genuine national feelings and affections — this absurd system has yielded to the out-breaking freedom of the spirit of the age. The same mighty revolution, that hurled the Bourbon tyrants from their throne, has annihilated for ever the chilling despotism of the Stagirite over the fair fields of literary France.

We have spoken thus freely of Mr. Grimké's performances, because we feared lest the sanction of his name should procure for them a more favorable reception than their merits can justify. We have commented upon them as literary performances, in part, because they are a convenient specimen of a gaudy and seductive style of writing, which is getting to be too common among us, more particularly, truth compels us to add, among the ardent intellects of the 'generous South.'

We have also criticized his system, as far as we could conjecture its purport from loose and scattered hints. The discourses have obtained a pretty extensive circulation throughout our country, and have made, as we understand, many and intelligent proselytes. They seem to us, however, to contain the germ of a system, which, if carried into execution, would bring sacred literature, by reason of the superficial character it would necessarily assume, into great and unmerited contempt. It is because his system proposes an overturn in the present modes of education, and the building up of a new one, with no distinct exposition of the means, effects, or objects of such a change; it is because he has lent an influential name, a pious character, respectable attainments, and an ardent enthusiasm, to what we conceive to be a wild and visionary project, that we have commented thus freely and at length upon these two discourses, the faults and contradictions of which, under any other circumstances, we should hardly deem it necessary seriously to expose.

We have admitted, of course, that the Bible should be made the text-book of moral and religious duty, in all education, from the infant school to the University. To every scheme for the promotion of Christian influences upon the character and heart, we feel bound, as Christian men, to lend a helping hand. But we think we have shown the inexpediency, if not the impossibility, of making the sacred writers

the teachers of literary taste, and their productions the foundation of a common literary education. What then should be the foundation of literary education? We answer, The Grecian and Roman classics. Not that the present modes of instruction need no change. Far from it. The true intellectual cultivation, which belongs to a mind deeply imbued with classical learning, and which has been splendidly exhibited by a countless host of the great scholars of Europe, will never be duly appreciated among us until the thorough, extensive, philosophical mastery of the polished literatures of antiquity, so common in the venerable abodes of learning across the Atlantic, shall be rivalled by the younger worshippers of the Muses in these American states.

Our reasons for choosing the Greek and Roman classics, as text-books in literature, may be summed up in a few distinct propositions.

1. The study of Greek and Latin, merely as languages, affords discipline admirably adapted to the youthful mind. It requires the constant exercise of acuteness, discrimination, comparison, and the reasoning power. And this is true to a much greater extent of the ancient than of the modern tongues, by reason of the superiority of the former over the latter, in the thorough display of the principles of grammar and rhetoric.

2. The Greek and Latin languages are, in a great measure, the basis of our own. Our own language ought to be made one of the most important objects in a scheme of education. To understand it thoroughly, an etymological knowledge of Greek and Latin are essential.

3. Classical literature is intimately interwoven with English literature. We do not allude to an influence like that of the doctrine of the Unities on the French drama; but the general influence of classical cultivation upon the noble productions of English intellect. The fine thoughts of antiquity, like threads of gold, run along the web of our literature, and cannot be separated from it, without destroying the beauty of the texture. But every scholar ought to understand the literature embodied in his own native tongue, and this cannot be without a knowledge of Greek and Latin.

4. The excellences of ancient literature, in a merely literary view, justify our conclusion. The best works of the Greeks

and Romans have come down to us, while their second and third rate writings have perished. This is true as a general rule, though there are some exceptions. The character of these works is established by the consenting voices of many generations, and is obvious to every man who will study them with an impartial mind. They present, therefore, a means of literary culture not subject to the fluctuations of modern taste.

5. The Grecian and Roman intellect was placed in circumstances sufficiently like our own, to instruct us in the general operations of the human mind; and sufficiently different, to open a curious and interesting page in intellectual history; a page, which we are able distinctly to comprehend; while the case is widely different in regard to Jewish literature.

6. The practical use to which many portions of ancient literature, as the oratory, for example, may be put, in preparing the mind for the duties of professional or public life, we consider a mighty argument in their favor. The proposition, that an intimate acquaintance with the minds of such men as Demosthenes and Cicero, together with a knowledge of the steps by which they attained such an intellectual superiority over their respective contemporaries, is profitable to him who aims at usefulness and distinction at the bar or in the councils of his country, needs no more than a naked statement to be at once acknowledged.

We have neither time nor space to carry these propositions into all their details, nor do we think it necessary. Every well read scholar will be able, from his own experience and memory, to substantiate them. These propositions are far from exhausting the subject, but we believe they comprehend the most important points in the argument for classical learning.

A truly philosophical education is that which unfolds the moral and intellectual powers with the nearest approach to perfection. Intellect, with no moral principle to control it, is a worse than worthless thing. It endangers not only the happiness of its possessor, but spreads, with a fatal frequency, desolation and misery wherever it turns its blighting and withering step. Look at the splendid, but dreary ruins, in which Byron and Shelley, and other members of that false but fascinating school, have left their names recorded;

and let the melancholy prospect serve as a memento, never to be forgotten, of the insufficiency of genius, however brilliant, however capable of 'glancing from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,' for happiness, for usefulness, for peace, without the strong, the unfailing support of moral and religious principle. A true system of education is 'that which unfolds the moral and intellectual powers, with the nearest approach to perfection.' It teaches, in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel, the paramount duty of following the dictates of conscience, at the peril of losses, imprisonment, and death itself; in opposition to the bribes of pleasure, the seductions of the world, the fascinations of temporary but perishing renown. It teaches, in accordance with the spirit of classic poetry, to recognise the 'Sentiment of Beauty,' implanted by nature in the human soul, in all its countless and Protean forms; whether it 'stand confessed' in the mild and majestic repose of the productions of antiquity, or burst out with surpassing splendor in the creations of modern genius.

ART. V. — 1. *The Young Reader; to go with the Spelling Book.* By JOHN PIERPONT. Boston. Richardson, Lord, & Holbrook. 1830. 18mo. pp. 162.

2. *Peter Parley's Tales about the Sun, Moon, and Stars. With numerous Engravings.* Boston. Gray & Bowen, and Carter & Hendee. 1831. 18mo. pp. 116.

3. *Tales of Travels, West of the Mississippi.* By SOLOMON BELL, Late Keeper of the Traveller's Library, Province-House Court, Boston. With a Map, and numerous Engravings. Boston. Gray & Bowen. 1830. 18mo. pp. 162.

4. *Cousin Elizabeth.* By the Author of 'A Visit to the Sea-side.' Boston. Leonard C. Bowles. 1830. 18mo. pp. 210.

5. *The Children's Robinson Crusoe; or the Remarkable Adventures of an Englishman, who lived Five Years on an unknown and uninhabited Island of the Pacific Ocean.* By A LADY. Boston. Hilliard, Gray, Little, & Wilkins. 1831. 12mo. pp. 367.

6. *The Little Girl's Own Book.* By Mrs. Child. Boston. Carter, Hendee, & Babcock. 1831. pp. 263.

Here is a tolerably long list of children's books, published in one city, within a month or two of each other, and yet it by no means comprises all which have appeared in Boston at about the same season, the stirring season of Christmas and New Year. Nor do we mean to say, that the books which we have named, are the only good ones of this large and recent family. We have selected them from the mass, principally because they are in our possession, lying before us on our table. Being certainly among the best, however, we intend to give each one of them a separate place in this article, and record briefly our opinion of its merits.

We shall not stay to institute any long discussion concerning the causes, which have brought such a little troop among us, because we conceive that they are apparent enough, and may be stated in a few sentences. In the first place, there are a great many children to be instructed and entertained. Secondly, there are a great many parents, who are desirous that their children should be well instructed, and rationally and innocently entertained. Thirdly, there are a great many teachers, who have divers systems, notions, and tastes regarding education and books. And fourthly, there are a great many writers, among whom are able ones, who are interested in the subject of juvenile instruction, and who are ready to devote much of their time to the improvement of the rising generation. And thus it comes, that there are a great many books for children, and that the number is constantly increasing. For ourselves, we regard the operation of these causes with so much complacency; we are so well pleased that children should read, and that so much industry should be maintained, and so much talent employed in the work of supplying them with matter for reading, that we confess ourselves not at all alarmed at the numbers of juvenile books, which every where solicit attention. Nevertheless, we would not cease to warn parents, and others to whom the guardianship of youth is in any way entrusted, to be careful in their selection of books, and not to run into the error of confusing young minds with an indiscriminate variety and rapid succession of objects, and creating a diseased appetite for novelty, which may never be cured.

And now, asking their pardon, we turn to our friends whom we have left waiting above.

1. The Young Reader presents himself first, and meets with our hearty welcome. This excellent little school-book is prepared by a gentleman, who has already furnished the higher forms of our schools with *Readers*, which have deservedly obtained an uncommon share of public favor. It appears to us to answer its purpose completely, as a companion to the spelling-book, though it should not be put into the hands of children who are younger than about five years of age. There are little books in existence, composed chiefly of words of one syllable, which are calculated to interest children who are just out of their alphabet. The prettiest of these which we have seen, is called 'Mamma's Lessons,' of which an American edition was lately republished in Salem. But for children from five, or thereabouts, to seven, or perhaps even eight years of age, the Young Reader is the best reader we are acquainted with. The pieces contained in it are various in their topics, simple in their language, engaging in their matter and manner, and conveniently broken up into short paragraphs. The book is calculated to take children, of the ages we have mentioned, by the hand, and lead them along the path of learning 'by a sweet and easy manuduction.'

The following prayers in verse, for evening and morning, written, as we understand, by the compiler of the volume, are beautiful.

'*Evening Prayer.*

'Another day its course hath run,
And still, O God, thy child is blest;
For thou hast been, by day, my Sun,
And thou wilt be, by night, my rest.

'Sweet sleep descends my eyes to close;
And now, when all the world is still,
I give my body to repose,
My spirit to my Father's will.

'*Morning Prayer.*

'O God, I thank thee that the night
In peace and rest hath passed away;
And that I see, in this fair light,
My Father's smile that makes it day.

'Be thou my Guide; and let me live
As under thine all-seeing eye;
Supply my wants; my sins forgive;
And make me happy when I die.' —p. 113.

2. PETER PARLEY is, we believe, a great favorite with children, because in a simple way, which they like and understand, he has been telling them tales about almost every thing. This is an intimacy, which we have no intention or wish of disturbing. The TALES ABOUT THE SUN, MOON, AND STARS, will furnish young people with about as much astronomy as they can comfortably bear, in such a manner as to engage their pleased attention, and imprint the facts permanently on their memory. They very early desire to know something about those splendid lights and sparkles, the sun, moon, and stars; and they may be made to know much, if their capacities are consulted as they are by their friend Parley. We were sorry to observe some mistakes, in point of fact, in the present edition; but these, as we are informed, are corrected in another, which will be published before what we are now writing is printed. Particular care should be taken to make all elementary instruction as accurate as possible. Error, planted in the tender mind, is apt to become deeply rooted, if not fruitful, unless eradicated by subsequent cultivation.

3. The next volume in order on our list, seems free from this fault of incorrectness. So far as we can judge, the TALES OF TRAVELS, WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI are an accurate abstract of the Travels of Lewis and Clarke, Major Long's Expedition, and Jewett's Narrative. All the matter in the originals which would prove tiresome to children, or which on any account they ought not to read, is left out in this volume. To its entertaining character we cheerfully bear witness; and doubt not that still louder witness will be borne by the little folks for whom it was compiled. Other Tales of Travels, in other parts of the world, will follow these, if these are encouraged as we suppose they will be. Authenticity and truth, as well as amusement, are to be consulted throughout the series. We feel bold to say, that places and people will be set forth every where more accurately than in the title-pages, where a certain 'Traveller's Library in Province-House Court' is spoken of, which we

never heard of before, and a Mr. Solomon Bell is represented as its Keeper, who would be as difficult to find in the city as his library. The fact is, and we may as well declare it, that Peter Parley and Mr. Bell are one and the same person, whose real name is neither Parley nor Bell.

4. We can form hardly a better wish for our young friends, than that they may all have one such cousin, at least, as Cousin Elizabeth. The writer of the delightful little volume which bears this title, is, we are told by the gentleman who edits it, an English lady, who has given us Americans the first reading of her work, — a privilege for which she has our sincere thanks. It is so interesting, that children, of an age to understand it, will read it with avidity, and so full of real instruction, that they cannot read it without deriving from the perusal some benefit. It offers a striking example of the universal applicableness and utility of all moral truth, which is fitly expressed, inasmuch as it is calculated, as the editor well remarks, to instruct parents as well as children. We think, indeed, that, perfectly adapted to the minds of young persons as the book is, grown persons may receive even more advantage from it; so important are the truths which it propounds, and so felicitously are they set forth and clothed. Many of the conversations have all the point, without any of the dulness, of moral lectures. Take for instance the following conversation, or lecture on politeness.

'"Well, Arabella," said Charles, "what makes you think mamma would not like it?"

'"Because I have heard her say, she should not wish any of us to be much with Mr. Fyley, and particularly not Arthur, because he would be the most likely to catch his odd ways."

'"He is very good and very clever," said Charles; "I wish mamma would not be so particular about politeness, and all that sham stuff."

'"Sham stuff!" repeated Arabella, with a look of horror. "What would mamma say if she heard you? but you are only joking, for you are polite yourself sometimes, and you like polite people."

'"Not I, in truth; I cannot bear the sight of them. Think of that old Mr. Porceum, that used to come and call on aunt Price! if all the world were like him, there would be nothing but bowing and scraping, and begging other people to go first;

and those very, very polite people will give you any trouble rather than seem to do a rude thing. I say it is all sham."

'"I wish you would not use that ugly word; besides, it is not all sham."

'"If you mean kindness, or any thing real, it is one thing," said Charles; "but where is the kindness in taking off one's hat, or getting up when a stranger comes into the room? What good can it do him?"

'"I suppose he would feel uncomfortable if you did not," said Arabella, "because he knows it is the custom; but I was thinking of another sort of politeness, I was thinking of people who always find out what one likes, and help any one out of little troubles, and seem as if it was a pleasure to do any thing for you."

'"If that is what you mean by politeness, I am sure Mr. Fyley is ten times more polite than old Mr. Porceum," said Charles.

'"Yes; Mr. Fyley is very glad to do any thing for one, but then he is not polite. He contradicts mamma so, sometimes when she is ill, that it makes her much worse, (mamma says so herself;) and he says such odd things. No, Charles, you cannot call Mr. Fyley polite."

'"I did not call him polite," said Charles, laughing, "I called Mr. Porceum polite."

'"Mr. Porceum is very formal, but he does not care whether he gives pain or not; do not you remember —?"

'"Yes, I remember very well," said Charles, "and I hate to think of that story."

'"Cousin Elizabeth is very polite," said Arabella, after a few moments' silence; "I suppose it is because she is so good-tempered."

'"I like her of all things," said Charles, "but I do not call her polite; she is not at all troublesome with her politeness; she never makes a fuss with it."

'"No, because it is quite easy and natural to her," said Arabella; "and so it is to you; but I know how difficult it is. It would be quite impossible for me to be as polite as Elizabeth."

'"As how, pray?" said Charles; "why should not you be as polite as you please?"

'"Because I really cannot." As she said these words, Arthur peeped in at the door, and asked for his cousin. "She is not here."

'"Where is she?"

'"I do not know," replied Arabella. Now "do not know" is the most proper answer in the world upon paper, but it so happens that there are many ways of saying "do not know." There is one way which means, or seems to mean, "and I do not care:" there is another which says, "I do not know, but I wish I did, as you ask me." Arabella's, on the present occasion, was neither of these; it was, "I do not know, but I am thinking of something else," which is nearly, but not quite, "I don't care." Arthur felt this, but he shut the door, and said nothing. Charles felt it, and he knew what Arabella meant when she said she could not be polite.'—pp. 177—182.

The story is exceedingly simple; but the scenes are so full of animation, and Elizabeth, 'the spirit of them all,' performs her part so admirably, that the book is as entertaining, or was so to us, as if it had involved and evolved one of the most intricate and romantic of plots.

5. Highly successful, too, has been the lady-writer of The Children's Robinson Crusoe. With all the respect which we feel for the real old Robinson Crusoe, who was the friend of our own childhood, we must confess that we used to be, occasionally, more tired than edified by his long soliloquies and conversations, and less edified than tired by his accounts of his slaughtering conflicts with the poor savages. 'The Children's Robinson Crusoe' is free from the charge of prolixity in remark and argument, and kills not a single human being while he is on his island. The narrative, though founded essentially on the old story, differs greatly from it in its details, and constantly aims to instruct and inform as well as to amuse. The style is simple and easy, like the original; the interest is uninterrupted; and many words and things are explained, which to children need explanation.

One circumstance appears to us a defect in this book. It is the introduction of some supernatural, unaccountable impressions, by which the conduct of Robinson is represented as having been, in one or two instances, determined. These are brought into the story, not as the superstitions of a young sailor, but as real warnings of danger, and worthy of belief and attention. It is true, that these supposed inspirations may be regarded merely as the belief of Robinson, expressed in his own narrative of himself, and may be thus

explained to children, by those who would not wish them to adopt such notions as realities. Still, the introduction of them in a work of this kind, can hardly be defended, we should think, on any better ground, than could the introduction of any controverted doctrine of theology, which the hero might have believed and maintained. With regard to the question itself concerning these supernatural intimations, though we cannot now enter into a discussion of it, we will remark, that the human imagination may easily be set to work to manufacture all sorts of impressions, and that should civilized, Christian men fall into a habit of paying a careful attention to these, and consulting them as oracles, instead of guiding themselves by the reason which their Maker has given them, they would be taking a long stride back toward the dark ages. There is no knowing where to stop, when we begin to give heed to any auguries, save those of a sound head and a good heart. Both a sound head and a good heart has Robinson; and, with the little exception which we have expressed, we commend him earnestly to the notice and affections of young people.

6. The Little Girl's own Book, by Mrs. Child, is of a different character from any of the above publications, being intended principally to amuse the leisure and play hours of its readers, by initiating them into the mysteries of Blind Man's Buff, Hunt the Slipper, Riddles, Charades, &c. It is prettily embellished, and easily takes precedence of all books of its class, for children, which have been published here. Considering the variety of matter which it contains, it appears to be remarkably free from mistakes. If we had seen Mrs. Child while she was writing down the following *puzzle*, PRSVRYPRFCTMNVRKPTHSPRCPTS— we should have requested her to add the letters T N, and then the whole would have read, by the mental insertion of the vowel E, as we are told it may actually be read, inscribed under the Commandments in the chancel of some old church in England, thus,

> Persevere, ye perfect men;
> Ever keep these precepts ten.

But by omitting the last two consonants, she has lost all the rhyme, and something of the reason of the puzzle. We were somewhat surprised, too, knowing her opportunities of infor-

mation, as well as her own literary accomplishments, to find her stating the word *automaton* to be adopted from the *Latin* language.

And we are quite as much surprised to find our own gravities dwelling on matters of this sort. But fathers and mothers, at least, will, we trust, readily pardon us, even should our taking an interest in whatever concerns the education of children, require a pardon from any quarter.

ART. VI. — 1. *Sermons on Various Important Public Occasions.* By ROBERT HALL, A. M., Leicester. London. T. Hamilton. Pater-Noster Row. 1824. pp. 370.

2. *The Works of the* Rev. ROBERT HALL., A. M., *Minister of Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, England. First complete Edition; with a Brief Memoir of the Author.* In two volumes. New York. G. & C. & H. Carvill. 1830. 8vo. pp. 439 and 491.

3. *Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Andrew Fuller, Late Pastor of the Baptist Church at Kettering, and First Secretary to the Baptist Missionary Society.* By J. W. MORRIS. First American, from the last London Edition. Edited by RUFUS BABCOCK, Jun. Boston. Lincoln & Edmands. 1830. pp. 320.

4. *Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British India and its Dependencies.* Vol. XXVIII. London. 1829.

THE Baptists have long been known as a numerous and respectable body of Christians in Protestant Europe and in this country. In England, they form one of the three great denominations, into which the Dissenters are usually divided; and from their earliest history, which they trace back to the days of Wickliffe (among whose followers there were those, who denied the validity of Infant Baptism), they have borne their full share of the penalties and disabilities, common to all non-conformists, in addition to others, which at certain periods were inflicted for their peculiar sentiments as Baptists. They have been, and are still, divided into two great classes, — the General and the Particu-

lar Baptists; the former, maintaining the belief of *general* redemption, and of the other doctrines of Arminianism; the latter adhering to the five points of Calvinism, and limiting their communion, or the participation of the Lord's Supper, to their own particular sect.

In Holland and in Germany, they have usually been called Anabaptists, or Mennonites, from Menno, a native of one of the smaller principalities in Germany, and a convert from the Roman Church in the earlier part of the sixteenth century; who for his genius, eloquence, and zeal, has been regarded, to some extent, as the head of the Anabaptists. In Italy and the South of Europe, they have been classed with those ancient sects, the Albigenses and Waldenses; of whom, however, few in that part of the world remain at this day. Their history, especially in Germany, was the history of their depression and suffering; in part, unjustly inflicted by the persecuting spirit of the church from which they dissented; and, in part, richly deserved, as has been said, not for their religious opinions, to which they had a right, but for their defiance of civil government, and their factious, disorganizing conduct. They were also, for a period, in Great Britain as well as in this country, characterized rather by their zeal than their knowledge; by their contempt, or at least their neglect, of human learning as a qualification for the ministry; and by a general aversion to those distinctions, which obtain, and must be respected, not less within the church than in the world.

This, however, let it be remembered, is the history, not of the present, but of former times. Happily this darkness, and with it most of the delusions and extravagances with which it is united, has passed, and the light of knowledge, followed by its genial influences, has shone. The Baptists have partaken in the intellectual and religious progress of the times; and are now, as they have been for many years, respectable not only by their numbers and just influence as a body, but, to a large extent, by the attainments and acknowledged worth of their clergy.

Of these latter, there are many in England, who have acquired considerable distinction; not indeed, if we except a few names, for profound learning, for which the education of their seminaries, and we may add, the resources of their people, furnish but inadequate helps; but, for what is better,

a practical acquaintance with the Scriptures, and for all that is essential to the great objects of the ministry, — to the forming of useful and successful preachers, of faithful and devoted pastors. Of the Particular, or Calvinistic Baptists, from the days of Gill, whose learning would do honor to any University, and of Dr. Andrew Gifford, an assistant Librarian of the British Museum, and honored by many literary distinctions, as well as by his exemplary ministry, — there have certainly not been wanting those, whose conscientious devotion to the studies of their profession has only been exceeded by the purity and usefulness of their lives.

Our opportunities, however, have made us more familiar with the character, as a denomination, of the General Baptists. Among the most eminent of these, without referring to an earlier period, is Gale, the friend of Le Clerc, known by many excellent publications, and specially by his noble defence of religious liberty against the exclusive ministers of London, who in the memorable Exeter controversy on the Trinity, insisted upon subscription to human tests of Orthodoxy. There is also the celebrated James Foster, who became a convert to the practice of adult baptism after he had entered upon his ministry, and whose sermons and other works have given him a place with the best preachers and writers of his day. Having succeeded Dr. Gale in a Baptist church, where he officiated for more than twenty years, he was appointed the successor of Dr. Jeremiah Hunt; who, though not himself a Baptist, was the pastor, counsellor, and friend of that generous patron of learning and honored benefactor of Harvard College, Thomas Hollis, Esq. This gentleman, as is well known, was a Baptist; and it may be taken as no small proof of the liberality of his spirit, not only that his numerous benefactions, of which those to our University were but a part, were not confined to a party, but that he served for more than thirty years faithfully and cheerfully as deacon in a church, in which an Independent, or probably, as it would be termed among us, a Congregationalist was the pastor; expressing his cordial satisfaction in the sentiments and preaching of his minister, and availing himself of Dr. Hunt's counsel, with that of other of his most intimate friends, of whom were Drs. Harris, Lowman, and Neal, in the foundation of his theological professorship, and his most important plans of Christian charity.

In a copious history of the English Baptists, not long since completed,* we find that the learned Dr. Fleming is mentioned as the successor of Drs. Foster and Hunt in Pinners-Hall, the same church of which Mr. Hollis was so long a member. We cannot indeed sympathize with this historian in his astonishment or regrets, that a pulpit once filled by Orthodox worthies of his own school, should be occupied 'by such persons as Dr. Foster and Dr. Fleming,' over the first of whom he laments, as 'that popular, but, alas! erroneous minister.' † But we accept his annals of that church as an interesting record of the progress of liberal opinions; and in the moderation of the ministers and the people, the Independent pastor uniting in cordial friendship with his Baptist deacon and Baptist hearers, we see a beautiful exemplication of a Christian charity, which, we would to God, might be imitated and honored in the present times.

Of some later worthies among the General Baptists, the names are already familiar to many of our readers. Among these are the ingenious and learned, but eccentric Robert Robinson; Evans, the well-known author of the 'Sketches'; and especially Dr. Joshua Toulmin, one of the best of men, as well as of faithful ministers; never to be mentioned but with reverence and affection by those who knew him. And there are others also, of both classes of Baptists, who in any larger enumeration than either our limits or opportunity will allow us here to make, would claim much more than a passing mention.

Of Robert Hall, whose works and character we have lately noticed somewhat largely, we are not curious in what sect or under what name he is to be classed. For though, as we have seen, he has engaged much and earnestly in the

* See an interesting History of the English Baptists, comprising the principal events of the History of Protestant Dissenters from the Revolution in 1668 till 1760, and of the London Baptist Churches during that period; in three volumes; by *Joseph Ivimey.*

† It does not appear, that Dr. Fleming was a Baptist. Like his predecessor, Dr. Hunt, he was of that denomination, which is now in London, somewhat strangely, called Presbyterian. He was a man of eminent learning and worth; was the author of several important works; and resisted in his youth several alluring offers of preferment in the Established Church, which the fame of his talents and character procured for him.

field of controversy, and sometimes, too, like most other controversialists, has attempted to settle questions of doubtful disputation by other helps than argument, yet we are disposed to regard him, as we believe posterity will regard him, and as we firmly believe he will himself wish to be regarded, when the bitterness of controversy shall be passed, not as the advocate of a sect, but as the preacher of righteousness; as the servant of God and of Christ Jesus for the salvation of men. In truth — may our Baptist brethren forgive the presumption — Mr. Hall belongs to no party. His genius, his eloquence, above all, his enlarged and elevated conceptions of the objects of religion, are the property not of a sect, nor even of a nation, but of Christendom. And we here dismiss a more particular consideration of this collection of his works, in which, as we have had occasion to remark, some things have found a republication, which should never have been republished, and one, which the writer himself absolutely interdicted, with the hope, that the judicious friends and admirers of this eloquent man, who are not confined to his native country or his own persuasion, would favor the religious community with such a selection, as they have reason to believe the writer himself would approve. We have now before us a beautiful volume of this description, by his London publishers, from which the 'Polemics' and Political Tracts, the bitterness of which was never redeemed by the ability, are all excluded, and only such pieces admitted, as are unquestionably worthy of his character. The title of this selection we have set at the head of this article. Of the sermons, of which it is chiefly composed, one had reached, even seven years ago, its *eleventh*, another the *fifteenth*, edition. We have already given large extracts from these in a previous Number; and our readers, who may have glanced over them, will not want even this remarkable attestation of the public favor, to show to them their excellence. They are the works on which, beyond all controversy, the eminence of Mr. Hall as a writer and a Christian teacher is destined to rest.

From these brief notices in the History of the Baptists, and of the most gifted individual who bears the name, we pass to a few remarks on those great religious enterprises, in which that denomination has now for many years been en-

gaged, and which, at present so extensively and zealously pursued by churches of other names, have become prominent features in the religious history of the times. We refer, particularly, as our readers will at once perceive, to the missions to India, which the Baptists, to a certain extent, originated; and which, proposing as the chief instrument, the translation and diffusion of the Scriptures, have become connected in their history with the efforts, for the same objects, of the British and Foreign Bible Society. To these great projects of Christian benevolence, Robert Hall appears, as occasion offered, by speeches at anniversaries and other still more appropriate professional services,* to have contributed the powerful aid of his genius and eloquence. And for the same reason, we have connected his works in this notice with a Memoir of the Rev. Andrew Fuller, who has obtained a well-earned reputation among 'the straiter sect' of his persuasion, as a preacher and writer; but especially as an able, faithful, and successful laborer in the cause of the 'Baptist Missionary Society,' of which he was the first Secretary, and to which, from its commencement in 1792, till his death in 1815, with unwearied and enthusiastic zeal, he devoted his strength.

Two copious Memoirs have been written of Mr. Fuller; one, by Dr. Ryland, 'his oldest and most intimate friend,' made up with very little judgment or taste from private papers and a diary; the other, by J. W. Morris, a convenient abridgment of which has just now been published among us, in which the author with affection, but discrimination, presents the character of his venerated friend in its just light; so that the impartial reader may perceive for himself, that Mr. Fuller, notwithstanding great disadvantages of early education, and some undeniable faults in his temperament and habits, was, on the whole, a truly estimable, and even extraordinary man. He may here see delineated, with much faithfulness, the character of one, who never sacrificed to the

* See his admirable charge to the Rev. Eustace Carey, January 19, 1814, on his designation as a Christian Missionary to India; a composition well worthy of perusal; abounding with the noblest conceptions of the true objects of a Christian mission; with wise counsel to one 'about to be separated from his brethren, and exposed to untried dangers'; and especially marked by that characteristic beauty in the writings of Mr. Hall — his expressive and felicitous *allusion* to the language of Scripture.

graces, or suffered his honest meaning to be misunderstood for want of a plain word or plain manners to interpret it; but with inflexible integrity and sturdy resolution pursued, and that generally to successful issues, the purposes which his sound understanding, his ready genius, his indefatigable zeal, and, we add, his unquestioned piety suggested.

The history of the mission to India, that favorite object to which Mr. Fuller devoted more than twenty years of his life, has often been referred to, and is, we may presume, sufficiently well known. That it originated in a true Christian zeal, in a persuasion of the unspeakable value of the gospel as the means of salvation, and from a hearty love of souls; that it has been pursued with an energy and perseverance worthy of the noblest cause; amidst obstacles, too, and sacrifices, which it belongs only to a true piety to sustain;—all this, and more, we cordially admit. We look, moreover, at the individuals who first engaged in them; who at the surrender of their homes and their country, amidst opposition from friends and enemies, Christians and heathen, maintained their course, though afterwards aided, unquestionably, by auxiliary and subordinate motives, with a sincere respect. We know, too, and in all candor we admit, that it is easy to look on at a distance, and find objections to an enterprise so arduous and complicate; and far easier to point out errors, to which the beginnings of such labors are exposed, than to be sure, that we should not ourselves fall into equal or greater errors. But that they, who have been chiefly employed in this undertaking, were qualified for the task; or that the translations they have produced, and are even now multiplying in the languages of the East, are entitled by their accuracy, or other essential qualities, to a general confidence; in fine, that they are to be received as faithful versions of the word of God, we are compelled by various evidence absolutely to deny. Of some of them it must be said, they are essentially defective; and that the hasty and profuse multiplication of them has been only a multiplication of errors. And how, we ask, should it be otherwise?

For, in the first place, before entering upon any particular examination, the *early education* of the gentlemen engaged in this most difficult of labors was insufficient for the purpose. Whatever may be said, and truly, of the talents of Dr. Carey, whose facility in the acquisition of languages has

been extolled, and which we do not deny, or of the merits of his coadjutors, Dr. Marshman and others; to whatever praise they may be entitled for their piety, industry, and zeal; it is next to impossible, that men, educated as they were, in Dissenting seminaries, and those of a second rank, in England, and commencing the work of translation at their time of life, should have been properly qualified for it. Nor are we here speaking of perfection, which is a vain hope; but of that degree of accuracy, indispensable to the very nature of the subject. Obvious objections present themselves upon this point from the intrinsic difficulty and delicacy of the undertaking; from the want of previous qualifications in those who commenced it; from the haste and fervor with which it was pursued; from the excessive number of versions attempted; and from the serious mistakes that have been proved to have been committed.

Upon each of these points, without entering into any general remarks, we shall briefly adduce the testimony of intelligent individuals in India, whose situation and knowledge entitle their testimony to confidence.

Of the *intrinsic difficulty* of the undertaking, let a native of India, a master of his own and of the English language, testify. Being asked, 'Are the translations, which have been made, faithful, or free from sectarian influence as to the expression of Christian doctrine?' his answer is,

'To both parts of this query my reply must be in the negative; I at the same time acquit these translators of wilful neglect or intentional perversion. They were, I think, too hasty to engage themselves in so difficult an undertaking.

'Ideas, in general, are as differently expressed in the idioms of the East from those of the West, as the East is remote from the West. Greater difficulty, therefore, must be experienced by a native of Europe in communicating European ideas in the idioms of Asia, than in conveying Asiatic ideas into the languages of Europe; so a native of Asia experiences greater inconvenience in expressing Asiatic ideas in European idioms, than in translating European ideas into an Asiatic language.

'About four years ago, the Rev. Mr. Adam, and another Baptist Missionary, the Rev. Mr. Yates, both well reputed for their oriental and classic acquirements, engaged, in common with myself, to translate the New Testament into Bengallee, and we met twice every week, and had for our guidance all the translations of the Bible, by different authors, which we

could procure. Notwithstanding our exertions, we were obliged to leave the accurate translation of several phrases to future consideration, and for my own part I felt discontented with the translation adopted of several passages, though I tried frequently, when alone at home, to select more eligible expressions, and applied to native friends for their aid for that purpose. I beg to assure you, that I (though a native of this country) do not recollect having engaged myself once, during my life, in so difficult a task, as the translation of the New Testament into Bengallee.' — *Correspondence relative to the Prospects of Christianity in India*, p. 137.

Thus much for the difficulty of the work, even to a scholar, well versed in both the languages, and in the idioms, in which one of them abounds. Next, we will notice the *manner* in which these versions have been executed; and for this we adduce the testimony of Mr. Adam, himself formerly a Baptist missionary, now a resident of Calcutta, and a careful observer of the facts, though he does not profess to have *full* information on the subject.

'The plan followed at Serampore in translating the Scriptures is, I have been informed, in all important respects, the following: — The copy for the First Edition of the Bengallee New Testament is said to have been prepared with Dr. Carey's own hand, although not without the assistance of a Pundit, and the corrections for successive Editions, reaching to the Fourth, which is the last published, the Fifth being in the press, have freed it from most of those gross blunders which originally deformed it. Having thus obtained a version of the New Testament in *one* language, and being desirous of translating it into *another*, he procured a person skilled in *both*, put into his hands the Bengallee version, and required him to translate from it into that other. The Pundit having completed some given portions of the translation into the new language, it is put to press while he goes on with another portion. The proofs from the press are sent to Dr. Carey for correction, who, during the time the Pundit was making the translation, has been engaged in acquiring some knowledge of the grammatical structure of the language, if he had not previously attended to it. When the proofs have received all the corrections deemed necessary, the sheet is thrown off, and so on till a complete edition of the Scriptures is printed. When the Scriptures are thus completed in any language, or when the different volumes or books are printed off, they are either sent to the country or province in which that language is

spoken, if there are any Missionaries there to receive and distribute them, or, if there are not any such Missionaries in that country or province, which has been most commonly the case, they are deposited in the warehouses or cellars. It is evident, that, according to this plan, the Bengallee version will not be the only basis of other translations. The next Pundit employed does not perhaps understand Bengallee, but understands that version which was made from the Bengallee, and consequently has *it* put into his hands as a standard. This affords reason to suppose, that the sense of Scripture must be very much diluted in these successive translations. Dr. Carey translates frequently, perhaps principally, from the English into Bengallee; the first Pundit he employs translates from his Bengallee version into another language; the second Pundit translates perhaps from the version of the first; and the third translates perhaps from the version of the second. How long it is since this system of successive translation was begun, or to what extent it has been carried, I do not know, but I have been positively informed that it has prevailed at Serampore for a considerable time, and that the Bengallee is not the only version from which the Pundits have been required to translate into other languages. The only redeeming circumstance is this, that all the versions, without exception, receive the final corrections of Dr. Carey, who will of course endeavour to raise them as nearly as possible to the standard of the Bengallee.

'The natives thus employed in translating are, I believe, generally speaking, genuine *Pundits*, i. e. learned men; a title which, like *Reverend* or *Doctor* among us, has come to describe rather the profession than the attainments of the individuals to whom it is given, but which, when properly used, is always understood to imply that they have a knowledge of Sunskrit. It would appear, however, that some of the native translators are ignorant of this language. Thus the person formerly, and perhaps still, employed on the Assamese version was a woman, who was pointed out to me, if I recollect aright, as probably the only female of that nation who could read and write. Ignorant of every language except her own, she had to acquire a knowledge of the Bengallee to enable her to translate from the version in that tongue. Again, a native convert, certainly ignorant of Sunskrit, some time ago informed me, whether from vanity or in truth I know not, that he was or had been employed on the Guzerattee version. A very extraordinary circumstance respecting one of the Serampore versions was related to me by the Rev. Mr. Bardwell, whom I had

frequent opportunities of seeing in Calcutta just before his return to the United States, and to whom I refer you for the confirmation of the following statement. The Kunkun language is described by the Serampore Missionaries as spoken on the western coast of India, somewhere I think between Bombay and Goa, and into this language they have made considerable progress in translating the Scriptures. But Mr. Bardwell declared to me, and, as he informed me, to the Serampore Missionaries themselves, that, after all the inquiries which he and his brethren had made respecting it, both amongst Europeans and natives, *no traces of such a language could be found.* Whether the Bombay Missionaries were not sufficiently strict in their inquiries, or whether the language is a new one, invented by the native translator for his own purposes, may to some appear doubtful. I confess myself inclined to adopt the latter alternative.' — *Correspondence, &c.*, pp. 8 — 11.

Again, respecting the *number* of the versions undertaken, connected with the *mode*, in which the translators acquire their knowledge of the various languages, he remarks;

'First, the number of translations attempted at Serampore seems too great. Speaking from my recollection of those memoirs which I have seen, they amounted at one time to more than thirty. With the exception of the Chinese version, Dr. Carey has been the only responsible European employed in carrying all these through the press, and it cannot but afford matter of deep regret, that one so eminently qualified to be useful in this department, should have appeared to lessen the value of his labors by spreading them over so wide a surface. When it is considered, that the Authorized Version was brought even to its present imperfect state only by the successive and collected labors of many different translators, whose native language was English, it might have been justly regarded as no ordinary achievement if he, being a foreigner, had brought any one of his versions to a similar state, by the labors of a life. But by engaging in so many, he has necessarily prevented himself from giving an adequate degree of attention to any one of them.

'Secondly, the mode in which the Serampore Missionaries have acquired a knowledge of most of those languages into which they have translated the Scriptures, does not warrant the conclusion, that their versions can prove acceptable to native readers. With the exception of a journey which Dr. Carey made into Bhootan in the early part of his Missionary

life, neither he nor his remaining colleague has visited any part of India beyond the boundaries of Bengal; and, consequently, of the numerous dialects current from one extremity of this vast peninsula to another into which they have attempted to translate the Scriptures, the Bengallee is the only one with which they are acquainted as a spoken language. Besides the Bengallee, indeed, the Sunskrit, Hindoosthanee, and Persian may be studied in Bengal; but the first is known, at the present day, only as a written language; the second is spoken throughout Bengal in a very corrupt form; and neither the second nor third, whatever be the facilities for acquiring it, has received much of their attention. With the exception, therefore, of the Bengallee, they are acquainted with the vernacular dialects of India only as written, and not as spoken, languages, which must have proved an insurmountable obstacle to the attainment of that idiomatical propriety, which a version into a living language should possess. Besides, it has, if I mistake not, been stated, that some of these dialects did not exist as written languages until the Scriptures were translated into them, and consequently with respect to such, they must depend, for all the information they possess, upon the natives whom they have employed to assist them.

'Thirdly, no attempt has been made to bring the translation of the Old Testament to the standard of Kennicott and De Rossi, or those of the New to the standard of Griesbach. That has been expressly left to future translators. *The Received Text has been invariably followed.*

'The design of these remarks is to show, that as a knowledge of the Scriptures is one of the most likely means for diffusing the influence of true religion, so the imperfect manner in which they have been presented to the inhabitants of India, must have tended to lessen the effect that might otherwise have been produced by them, when put into the hands of persons of understanding and reflection.' — *Correspondence, &c.*, pp. 70 — 72.

In reference to some gross mistakes, which, independently of all other sources of error, may arise from pure ignorance of the native idiom, and the great difficulty of representing it faithfully in another language, Mr. Adam thus writes;

'On the subject of native idioms, I would not for a moment presume to set my opinion in opposition to that of any of those worthy and able men who have engaged in translating the Scriptures into the languages of this country, and least

of all in opposition to that of the venerable Christian and extensive scholar, who has for so many years presided over the department of translations at Serampore. Instead of this, I will endeavour, as intelligibly as I can, to describe two mistakes, one in each of the two current Bengallee Versions of the New Testament, which were first pointed out to me by a native gentleman with whom I was reading the Scriptures in that language. That native gentleman has made a respectable proficiency in Sunskrit, as well as in Persian and Arabic.

'Dr. Carey, the author of one of the versions referred to, translates John iii. 15 and 16, in the following manner: — "That those who believe in him should not *utterly* perish, but that every one should have eternal life. God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not *utterly* perish, but have eternal life." The mistake to which I would request your attention, as materially affecting the meaning of the whole passage, is that denoted by the word printed in italics, and consisting in the insertion of the word so printed, not only without any corresponding term being found in the Greek, which I do not now insist on, but in such a connexion as to convey to a native a sense altogether repugnant to the doctrine and spirit of the gospel. "If then," inquired my native friend, "I do *not* believe in Christ, does this involve my *utter destruction;* not only my own destruction, but that of all connected with me? Is the belief of the gospel the only means of escaping from *utter destruction*, the destruction of myself, my wife, my children, my dependents, my servants, my ALL?" Whatever be the sense of the passage, this is not, and cannot be its sense, however conformable such a sense may be to Oriental ideas and Oriental usage; Esther ix. 25; Daniel vi. 24. Whether the passage refer to the temporal calamities of the unbelieving Jews, or to the future punishment of the wicked in general; whether it refer to that punishment as consisting in absolute annihilation, or in positive misery, as eternal in its duration, or corrective in its design, still it is the punishment only of personal unbelief and transgression. "The wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him," and not upon another. This is the dictate of reason, and the language of Scripture; and it requires no elaborate argument to vindicate the benevolent Jesus and his amiable disciple from the imputation of a contrary doctrine, since it is only an unauthorized addition to their words, which can afford the slightest ground for a charge so abhorrent to all the one ever taught, and the other ever wrote. Yet this is a doctrine, which, without knowing

it, I have perhaps thousands of times delivered in native assemblies, when I supposed that I was preaching the glad tidings of salvation; and this is a doctrine which the Missionaries who use this version continue to preach under the same delusion, for there is perhaps no single passage more frequently quoted than this in their public ministrations to the natives.

'Again, Mr. Ellerton, the author of the other Bengallee version, thus translates the 25th verse of the same chapter. "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews *about the purifying act.*" The meaning, I suppose, is about baptism, and, as would appear probable from the context, about the baptism of John. But my native friend informed me, that the form of expression here employed is in modest language invariably appropriated to that kind of purification or cleansing, which a Hindoo performs after having obeyed the calls of nature. This is a less serious, and is even a ludicrous blunder, but both sufficiently illustrate the importance and necessity of endeavouring, in the way I have already described, or in some other more effectual manner, to prepare native translators, whose acquaintance with the original languages of Scripture, or at least with the English, as well as with the vernacular tongue, can alone be a sufficient guard against such mistakes.

'After these examples, it is unnecessary to adduce others of a similar kind; although when it is considered, that both of them occur within the compass of the same chapter, it cannot seem improbable, that such might easily be found.' — *Correspondence, &c.*, pp. 105 — 107.

Mr. Adam further states, that in these translations the received text, and not the corrected text of Griesbach, has been invariably followed. And in giving the result of a careful comparison of several versions in his possession (one of which is by that celebrated missionary of the Church of England, Henry Martyn) and Griesbach's second edition, he thus observes;

'It cannot but excite deep regret that Mr. Martyn in particular, while justly ranking so highly for disinterestedness as a minister of the gospel, and for zeal as a missionary, should seem so far to have forgotten the claims which the Christian world had upon him as a divine and as a scholar. He was a member of an English University, of that University which has enjoyed the labors of Bishop Marsh; he was a fellow of a College; he was a clergyman of the Established Church; and

yet there is to be found in his version nearly as strict an adherence to the Received Text, and as wide and numerous departures from the critical standards of the original, as if he had been the unprivileged and unpatronized Dissenter.' — *Correspondence, &c.*, p. 114.

The testimonies, or opinions, we have already cited, refer chiefly to versions that were made and circulated between six and seven years ago. And we trust, that since that period some of the grosser errors have been corrected, and some progress towards more faithful translations has been gained. Still we have reason to fear, that the most material mistakes are continually propagated; and that much, very much, remains to be done, before the religious community can feel confidence in the labors of men, who, however respectable for their integrity and industry, for their piety and zeal, nay, as we do not question of Dr. Carey, for considerable attainments, are essentially deficient in the qualifications demanded for the faithful translation of the Scriptures. And we have before us a recent testimony, which seems to involve yet more serious objections, while it comes from a source of apparently unquestionable authority. From this, also, it will appear, that the British and Foreign Bible Society have incurred a full share of the censure, which has been so justly cast upon these defective and blundering versions.

In a Number of 'The Asiatic Journal,' for September, 1829, 'a clergyman of the Church of England, resident in the Bengal provinces, who is well known for his critical acquaintance with the Sanscrit and other Hindu languages, and whose name,' adds the Editor, 'we are authorized to publish, if necessary,' thus writes;

'"The public at home, and the religious public in particular, would learn with no little indignation (could they believe it), that the British and Foreign Bible Society has been lavishing the liberal contributions levied on their benevolent charity, during so many years past, in circulating (in India, at least) copies, multiplied copies, of our Holy Books in translations, dignified as such, which swarm with every fault of taste and criticism, shock common sense, and are at this moment, after multiplied editions, exactly fit for — the worms."' — p. 297.

And having remarked, that the charges urged against this great Institution, in some previous journals, of employing incompetent translators, &c., were very unsatisfactorily an-

swered; he adverts to the Serampore versions, of which, as is well known, Dr. Carey and his friends are the authors; and, particularly to the Serampore version of the New Testament into the Marat'ha language. Of this language Dr. Carey had previously published a grammar and a dictionary;

'"Both, however, [says this writer,] so extremely defective and erroneous, that they have been found of scarcely any use on this side of India. The language, therefore, into which the Serampore Marat'ha New Testament is translated, is not Marat'ha, either in all its words, its construction, or its idiom; and hence it is quite unintelligible to all persons whose vernacular dialect is Marat'ha."' — p. 298.

He then cites several examples. Passing over many, which will not be understood by the common reader, as they would require to be shown in the words of the language itself, we quote his remarks on two or three verses from the first chapter of John; which, as he declares, he faithfully *re-translates*, from the version in question, into English;

'"On what grounds, I must ask, has the second verse, 'The same was in the beginning with God,' been here translated THEY (or *these*) *at first* WERE *with God?* The use of the masculine plural must convey the idea of a plurality of Gods, and ought, therefore, to have been carefully avoided. But, [adds he in a note,] it occurs again in the verse immediately following, *and is invariably used,* as far as I have observed, *throughout this version,* in speaking of God or Jesus Christ."' — p. 299.

What is this, we ask, but an unpardonable ignorance, or negligence, or want of fidelity, in the *getting up* of this version? Again,

'"The third verse of this translation, literally re-translated, or at least the meaning of the words used, is as follows: *Every thing was formed, the production of* THEM, *and amongst so many of it formed not one thing, even was formed distinct from* THEM."' — p. 299.

The sense of such a translation, to say nothing of the substitution of the plural for the singular, we leave to be discovered by the ingenuity of the reader.

The eighteenth verse, of which the original simply is, 'No man hath seen God at any time,' is here rendered, 'No one *having seen* has ever found God'!

In the twenty-fifth and following verses, we fear there is

something more than negligence or ignorance. For the translators have rendered 'to baptize,' by a phrase, quoted in Marat'ha by this writer, which he says is 'compounded contrary to the idiom of the language, and can signify nothing else than *to give a dipping or immersion.*' — p. 300.

Other instances he adduces, from the same chapter, which would be only ludicrous, were it not that the sacredness of the subject makes them shockingly irreverent.

'"The thirty-second verse presents this most extraordinary and highly irreverent translation, '*I saw descending from heaven the Spirit like an Owl.*' The word has no other meaning! The same word is also used in the other three gospels."' — p. 300.

'"*Behold the Lamb of God*, is translated, *Behold the young of the sheep of God.* This periphrasis, [continues he,] is perfectly indefensible; because there is a word in Marat'ha for a *lamb*, and the word used by the translator is not Marat'ha."' — p. 300.

'"But, [as he proceeds to observe,] the defects of a translation of the Bible will not appear so much in such parts of it as are merely narrative; because, as in them the words in general retain their proper signification, faults of grammar and idiom may not completely obscure or misrepresent the sense of the original. But in all passages relating to the tenets and doctrines of Christianity, the inadequacy, to use no harsher term, of the Marat'ha version, becomes too glaring. Take, for instance, the 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th verses of the first chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, which are thus rendered: 'For our being pure, and with love before them blameless, before making the foundation of the world, having chosen us in it, in that manner for the purpose of heaven through Christ, having given all spiritual blessing, they have made us blessed, and by their favor have made us taken, in the beloved, for the praise of the glory of their grace, and to obtain adoption, that which according to the wish of their mind, through Jesus Christ, they formerly made determined to us. For that happy be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. In his love, through the blood of them, we, by the great riches of their grace, obtain deliverance from sin for the purpose of beatitude.'

'"To make sense of this strange assemblage of words is not my business. I have rendered them faithfully."'* — p. 301.

* '"More than faithfully, for I have translated several words in the sense intended, though they bear no such signification in Marat'ha.

Our readers will also note in this passage, in addition to its impalpable obscurity, the unwarrantable substitution in this, as in other places, of the plural for the singular form.

After so many evidences of ignorance, or negligence, or presumption, and we have selected but a few, omitting several minute criticisms, which exhibit even more glaringly the absurdity of the misinterpretation, we are constrained to assent to the justness of the remarks, with which this critical writer concludes. And in bringing this article also to a close, we have only to wish that a cause, so sacred and important, so interesting to the spiritual welfare of vast multitudes of our fellow-creatures, which has enlisted in its service the genius and eloquence of Hall, and the unwearied labors of Fuller and of so many devoted missionaries, may not longer be obstructed by errors either of ignorance or misguided zeal; the consequences of which, affecting, as they do, the prime instrument of all their labors, the word of God, no genius, however exalted, and no zeal, however fervent, can repair.

'"Before concluding, I cannot refrain from remarking, without intending the slightest disrespect to the missionaries at Serampore, that their zeal has neither been tempered nor guided by knowledge; and that their opinions respecting the proper manner of making translations proceed from an imperfect education. For had they studied the first principles of philology, and acquired a conversancy with two or more languages, or even with their own mother-tongue, and any Indian dialect, they must have observed that the mere translating from one language into another, word for word, without considering carefully the ideas actually denoted by each term used, and without paying attention to grammar and idiom, could never possibly produce a faithful and intelligible translation. But that the translation of the Marat'ha New Testament has been

---

The reader will, in particular, observe the constant use of the masculine plural, in reference to the Father or the Son, except in one place, where a typographical error may have occurred, consisting merely of the non-insertion of a diacritical mark, called *anuswar*, which is the sign of the Marat'ha plural. Fortunately, the horrid impiety of the above is rendered innocuous by the passage being constructed so ungrammatically and unidiomatically, as to be quite unintelligible to a Marat'ha. But in this style it is that all the doctrinal parts of the New Testament appear to be translated; and though the natives could not understand them, still were their attention by any means attracted to them, they have all sufficient sagacity to perceive that the plural is inconsistent with unity."'

made in this manner, the slightest inspection of it will at once show; and I fear, that were the other versions of Serampore also examined, they would all be found to have been executed in exactly the same manner. If so, it must be concluded, that the trouble and expense which have bestowed on these versions have been bestowed in vain; and that the object in view would have been more effectually promoted, had all this time and labor been employed in the proper translation of the Bible into some one native language.

'"It must at least be obvious, that the benefits expected to be derived from the translations are not to be reaped until they are presented to the natives in a form which would render their perusal easy and agreeable. For as long as they are full of grammatical errors, and written in an unconnected, mean, and unidiomatical style, no native will read them, or, should the exception occur, he will not understand them. But give them in an appropriate dress, and mere curiosity might attract the attention of many a native to them. I must, however, confess, that the translation of the Bible into any Asiatic language, seems to me to require such a thorough knowledge of the original, and such an intimate acquaintance with the modes of thinking, speaking, and acting of the people into whose language it is to be translated, as to render it a task of very doubtful success. The failure, therefore, of the missionaries is not surprising."' — pp. 302, 303.

ART. VII. — *The Political Class Book; intended to instruct the Higher Classes in Schools in the Origin, Nature, and Use of Political Power.* By WILLIAM SULLIVAN, Counsellor at Law. *With an Appendix upon Studies for Practical Men; with Notices of Books suited to their Use;* by GEORGE B. EMERSON. *New Edition, with Amendments and Additions.* Boston. Richardson, Lord, & Holbrook. 1831. 12mo. pp. 194.

THE utility of such a class book as this, is so obvious, that it is a matter of some surprise, that this is the first which has been offered to our schools. It is a matter also of congratulation, that the first has so fully supplied the existing need; that it should have been prepared by a gentleman so completely qualified for the task; and that instead of having been

committed, as a piece of job-work, to inferior hands, or usurped by some one possessing more confidence than ability or information, it was undertaken by one of our most accomplished and experienced lawyers, and executed with the care and thought which its importance demanded. For the service which Mr. Sullivan has performed, he has our sincere thanks. That his work is highly appreciated by the public, is proved by the appearance of a second edition, a few months only after the publication of the first.

The youth of our land are now furnished with a book which will afford them valuable elementary knowledge of law and government; of the laws and constitutions of their own country, and the several states of the Union; of the modes and forms of administering justice; of their own rights and obligations, capacities and duties, as citizens of the republic, members of the community, and creatures and subjects of the Universal Parent and Governor of men. Nor will the usefulness of this book be confined to the young. Many of their elders will be ready to confess themselves greatly deficient in much of the practical, every-day knowledge contained in it, and may, by resorting to its pages, obtain at an easy rate the information which their early education failed to impart to them.

We admire, and cannot too highly commend, the moral and religious character of this class book. Mr. Sullivan has every where inculcated the great principle, that good government, good citizenship, good morals, and pure Christianity go hand in hand. We never wish to see a religious party in politics among us, nor what is commonly called the union of church and state; but we do wish, most devoutly, to see both governors and governed acting in every relation and under all circumstances as moral and religious beings, and accountable to a higher than any earthly power. This we deem the only allowable, but at the same time the all-sufficient union between religion and politics; and it is this union which is promoted in the work before us, by the frequent inculcation of the truth, that every one is in duty bound to act virtuously and religiously, not only in his personal, domestic, and social, but in his civil and political relations.

The indispensable requisite of correctness has been carefully attended to in this volume. No less was to have been expected from its authors. So many and various, however,

are the topics which are handled, and the statements which are made in it, that it would be wonderful, indeed, if no inaccuracies could be detected, even after its late revision and correction. One only has fallen under our eye, and that is to be ascribed to some inadvertency. On page 134, in section 375, it is said, 'During this time one hundred and thirty thousand different *copies* of the Testament were examined and compared.' The statement should have been, and doubtless was intended to be, that by the collation or comparison of a large number of manuscripts, about one hundred and thirty thousand *various readings* were collected.

Mr. Emerson's 'Appendix' to the Political Class Book, is well adapted to increase its general usefulness. His catalogue of books, which may be profitably read in the principal departments of literature by those who have no time to become actual scholars, though necessarily brief, is judiciously drawn up, and may be followed with great advantage. As we wish to say something ourselves concerning books and reading, we shall take the liberty of using this part of the Class Book as our text.

That 'of making many books there is no end,' is an observation, as we all know, of high antiquity and authority. If there was occasion for uttering it in the time of the wise king, when the number of those who were in any way able to make books must have been very limited, and when the only method of multiplying copies was the slow and tedious one of actual transcription, how much more occasion is there now, when almost any one may undertake to make a book, of some kind or other, and when copies may be multiplied to any extent by the rapid operations of the press. Well may we moderns say, that of making many books there is no end, and not likely to be any end; and we may be disposed also to add, on a due consideration of the subject, that it is not desirable that there should be any.

It is very true, that all the great principles and maxims which are necessary for the guidance of life, may be stated in a small compass, and that they who roam from volume to volume, devouring the new before they have half digested the old, looking for the most satisfactory theory in the latest publication, and yet never satisfied or settled in their thoughts

and sentiments, will bring their minds into a lamentable habit of inconstancy and skepticism, and weary their flesh to no profit. This is most probably the meaning of Solomon in the words just now cited. Let us acknowledge that he speaks with his accustomed wisdom; and let us be willing to hear from him 'the conclusion of the whole matter,' and heartily and reverently allow, that 'to fear God and keep his commandments, is the whole duty of man.' They who lose sight of such momentous though simple truths, in wandering through many books, had better be without eyes to read; and the multiplication of the lights of mind is only added and folded darkness to those who are dazzled and bewildered instead of being cheered and guided by their radiance.

And yet, although the most essential truths may be compressed into almost any dimensions, more space is required when they come to be illustrated, adapted, recommended, and enforced. The means of knowledge must be furnished freely and copiously, though they are liable to be abused. When we consider the different tastes and different stages of advancement, of generations, countries, and individuals; when we consider that childhood, youth, and age, the quick and the slow, the sage and the savage, the man of leisure and the man of labor, demand to be severally accommodated with instruction and entertainment, according to their several wants; when the changes of society, the rise, decline, and fall of nations, the improvements and discoveries in art and science, and the various developements, situations, thirstings, and yearnings of the human mind and heart are brought into view, we shall partly see why it is necessary that many books, on many subjects, and of many kinds, should be made, and continue indefinitely to be made, and how natural it is that they should succeed each other, coming and going, living and dying, even like the vanishing races of men, with the exception of a few, which, like some names and some deeds, perpetually remain, because they have that within them which cannot decay or die.

The same truth may be presented in two, three, or a hundred different forms, and may be most useful and most convincing to one man in one of these forms, and to another man in another. The same individual, in different states of mind, and under varying circumstances, is to be addressed and moved by different trains of thought, and dissimilar

species of composition. In grief he will not choose the same book which he will take up when his heart is unburthened; and to-day he will be greatly profited by an author who will only weary him to-morrow. Some men pursue one particular branch of knowledge, and determine to make themselves masters of it; they therefore call for a number of books on one subject. Others prefer to know something of many branches, and their demand consequently is for a few books on a multitude of subjects.

These are some of the considerations, which show what a necessarily great and constant requisition there is for books, and afford satisfactory reasons for their diligent and ceaseless manufacture. We now propose to consider more in detail their character and value, their uses and abuses, their diverse connexions with our happiness, improvement, interests, and duties.

Let our attention be directed to them, in the first place, as the friends, companions, and instructers of our solitude. What honest friends, what sympathizing companions, what excellent instructers they are! How can a man be really solitary, when these and nature are with him and around him? How can it be said of him, that he is without society, even though no being of flesh and blood should be near him, when he can sit down in his closet with the best and brightest minds which ever dwelt and beamed in residences of clay; with the master-spirits of all time; with the souls of the mighty living and the mighty dead, the dead who yet are living; with ancient lawgivers, philosophers, and bards; with modern lawgivers, philosophers, and bards; with moralists and satirists; with civilians and divines; with navigators and travellers; with the explorers of nature and the professors of art; with patriots; with saints; with martyrs; with apostles of Christ; with prophets of God? Who shall say, that with these, he is alone? Who shall say, that in his sorrow he is without consolers; that in his joy he is without partakers and helpers of his joy; that in his desires for information he is without teachers; that in his trials and perplexities, and the various conditions of his mind and feelings, he is without spiritual advisers?

No, he is not alone. If he has books, and has learnt how to read them properly, he always has his friends about him, good and true ones. Is he fatigued with the labors of his

vocation? They will refresh him with their pleasant conversation; they will sing to him care-dispelling melodies. Has he met with coldness and indifference in the world? Their welcome is always kind and warm. Has he suffered injury? They will teach him how to bear it. Has he himself been erring from the right way? They will faithfully admonish, and gently reclaim him. Has he been hurt, or is he in danger of being hurt, not by the rudeness and ill-treatment, but by the flattery and indulgence of the world? Then how happy will it be for him, that in hours of retirement from outer parade and glare and excitement, he can call a council around him, who will speak plain truths of his humanity, without disguise or equivocation, and check and sober him, without fear on their part, or offence on his. Has death taken away some one who was very dear to his heart, and delightful to his eyes? They will show him the path which the departed soul has travelled, and teach his soul how to pursue the same. Does age come silently upon him, and draw the invisible but irresistible meshes of its net closer and closer around him, shortening his walks, and entangling and tying up his powers, till he is brought in and confined within his own doors? He is there among his old friends, who, as they will be more than ever necessary to his comfort, will be more than ever valuable to him, making him forget that he is a prisoner, and causing him to wear his bonds easily and lightly, till the summons is sent for his release.

How much better it is for a man to secure such friends for his inmates, than to neglect all opportunities of cultivating their intimacy, till he finds, as time after time he comes in from the streets and public places, and turns and shuts his door, that he enters an empty house — so utterly, drearily empty, perhaps, that its vacant gloominess drives him out again into the haunts of dissipation and folly, or the highways of excess and crime. How much better it is for him to occupy his solitary hours in the acquisition of useful knowledge, than to dream them away in broken thoughts and idle fancies, or doze them off in stupid inanity. How much better to be perpetually filling his mind with the well arranged stores and garniture of other minds, than to let it lie unfurnished and unimproved, till dust and dampness collect and settle in it, and birds of night and ill omen make it their chosen habitation.

We do not say, that a man ought not to think and meditate, as well as read, and commune in his chamber with his own heart as well as with others. He should do both. He should read, that he may think with advantage, and have materials for thought; and he should think, that he may read with discrimination and profit. His meditations will be very likely to be unconnected and partial, and end in prejudiced conclusions, if they are not guided, filled up, and corrected by judicious and liberal reading. If he does not wish, therefore, that his solitary hours should be unprofitable or seductive; if he dreads such an event, let him employ them in the perusal of good books. And especially let him acquire a familiarity with that book, which is commonly and deservedly called the best book, and the book of God.

'When quiet in my house I sit,
Thy book be my companion still,
My joy thy sayings to repeat,
Talk o'er the records of thy will,
And search the oracles divine,
Till every heartfelt word be mine.'

Books are not only the friends of individual solitude, but also of the family circle. They contribute to bind it together, to fill up deficiencies, to cover flaws, to make it closer and brighter and firmer. By engaging the thoughts, improving the taste, and exciting the kindly feelings of the members of a household, they render each one more considerate and gentle, and more useful and agreeable to the rest. They insensibly introduce mental grace and refinement, and not only so, but refinement and grace of manners, wherever they become favorites. Show us a family in which the best and purest authors are loved and read, and we care not in what nominal rank of society they are stationed, or what may be their wealth or want of it, or what may be their daily avocations,— but we will answer for them, that vulgarity and coarseness have no place at their meetings, and that domestic peace is a dweller among them. Books are, indeed, great promoters and preservers of harmony. They occupy the time which might have furnished opportunity to discord; and they often, no doubt, soothe irritated passions, and calm excited feelings, or give them a beneficial direction. A tender passage of poetry, or an affecting incident or scene in prose, may bring hearts together in cordial amity,

which, through some trifling cause, are beginning to be estranged from each other, and tune to perfect unison and sympathy nerves which have been trembling on the verge of open dissonance.

The domestic services which books are qualified to perform, are particularly valuable when the business and bustle of daylight are over, and the active interests of life are hushed into slumber under the brooding wings of night. The master of the house comes home from his office, counting-room, or workshop, the children come home from their schools or places of employment, the mother's household duties are done, and they sit down together. What shall they do with the impending hours, to keep them from hanging heavily? We suppose that there are some families, in town and country, who find, if there is no party to go to, or no place of public amusement to offer its attractions, such as they may be, or nothing particularly interesting to discuss in the events of the day, or the character or fortunes of their neighbours, that the long winter evenings, by which we mean the evenings of six months in our year, are apt to move off rather slowly and wearily. This would not be so, we are persuaded, if they would just call in to their assistance one or two of the friends whom we have been recommending. How much more swiftly and pleasantly, not to say profitably, the hours would then glide away! The darkness might gather murkily, and the storm beat fiercely without, and they who sat within, listening to the arguments, the facts, the fictions, or the minstrelsy of some favorite writer, would scarcely heed or hear the terrors of old night. It may be, that they might be brought to such a pitch of satisfaction and contentment, as not greatly to envy their acquaintance whom they know to be dancing or dressing for a dance, or perhaps seeing Shakspeare's heroes and heroines, and even Shakspeare himself, murdered at the theatre.*

We are aware that young people especially require, and we grant that they ought to have, some more active entertainments than the calm reading of books. But we know,

* We believe, however, that the life of Shakspeare is not often attempted at the theatre, but that other authors are more frequently brought forward there who have this advantage over him, that they cannot *be* murdered.

too, that they need to be moderated in their love and pursuit of such entertainments, and directed to some other and better modes of occupying their time. They will very easily, unless differently guided, run into a habit of craving what are called harmless pleasures to such an immoderate degree, as to be satisfied with nothing else, to be discontented with home, unless they can have some gay company there to cheer up the old dull walls, to welcome with avidity every new invitation which calls them abroad, to be devoted to the niceties and mysteries of dress, and to become averse to sober occupations and solid acquirements. Then it will be found, too late, perhaps, that these harmless pleasures have turned out, in the end, exceedingly hurtful,—and not because they were not really innocent, and even useful in themselves, as occasional relaxations, or promoters of elegant intercourse, but because they were made the sole objects of attention and desire, and suffered to come and reign in the mind exclusively and supremely. To guard youthful minds against such a catastrophe, the sad catastrophe of indolence and emptiness, few more effectual steps can be taken, than to inspire a love of reading, and judiciously to superintend the course of it; and this is to be done most easily and happily in the family circle, amidst all its influences and attractions, and with the assistance of them all. A taste for reading, being once acquired, will, besides providing a pleasure, great in itself, and constant in its supplies, lead those who possess it to a just estimate of the value of time and the worth of their minds, and prevent them from wasting their time and starving their minds in a rapid pursuit of amusement, and a continual haunting of places of amusement. It will teach them to rank showy accomplishments in their due subordination to intellectual and moral improvement. It will give them something more valuable to own and put to use, than can possibly be given to them by those social excitements, which, however well they may be in their place and in moderation, are not even harmless in their excess; and it will contribute in several ways to prepare them for the future performance of domestic duties, in those days when mere amusements will have lost their relish, or when a strong relish for them will have lost all title to propriety and respectability.

If compared with many others, our own may with perfect

truth be called a reading community. But we do not read at all too much. It would be for our benefit if we read more. With a more decided and general love of books, we should be more able to withstand, than it is to be feared we now are, the many temptations which flow in upon us with the rising tide of wealth and luxury; and the habits and condition of the community in this respect will of course depend chiefly, if not entirely, on the habits of the families which compose it.

We come now to speak of books in their relations to society, and to ourselves as members of society.

Considered in their relation to society in the aggregate, we may say, that although society may be polished and courteous, and, to a certain degree, delightful without them, it cannot be intellectually or morally elevated without them. No society but that, in the composition of which there is a plentiful infusion of literature and a taste for literature, can possess that high tone and finish, which can alone satisfy a cultivated mind, or show forth the full dignity of social man. Conversation will be nothing more than small talk, where the great majority of minds are perpetually running upon small things. Grave topics cannot be introduced, or if introduced, cannot be well sustained, where there is no preparation for their entertainment, and no disposition or ability to prolong their stay. It is not at all desirable, that people should be always talking about books; and an affectation of literature is often more voluble than is the reality. But the character of the subjects of conversation; the manner in which they are discussed; the readiness which brings forward arguments; the discrimination which examines them; the nature of opinions advanced, if it is only in the way of casual remark, whether concerning an author or a passing event, a poem or a landscape; and the style in which even matters of ordinary occurrence or trifling moment are handled and played with — these it is which indicate habits of reading, which show thoughts that are trained and strengthened, and taste that is cultivated and refined, by an acquaintance with books. This is the perfection of society. This is its mature and grown-up state. In conditions short of this, it is in its youth, its childhood, or its infancy.

But in almost any condition of civilized society, an acquaintance with books will conduce much to individual respectability

and success. As all knowledge is power, the means of power to be found in books are in proportion to the knowledge which they contain and are able to impart. If, therefore, books contain any knowledge at all, which cannot as easily and quickly be acquired without them as with them, there will be an inequality between those who read and those who read them not. If our situation is such, that we are surrounded by those who are fond of reading and study, we must read too, in order that we may know as much as they, or at least be on a general footing of equality with them; and if those who are about us are not of literary habits, it will then also behove us to read, in order that we may know more than they, and secure the advantages, the fair and honorable advantages, which superior knowledge will confer. Books fit a young man for the company of his seniors, and they make an old man doubly instructive to his juniors. They assist a person in his profession or trade; for though a mere theorist cannot stand in competition with a practical workman, yet one who joins study and practice judiciously together, will most usually far surpass one who depends alone on his own invention and experience. And if he should extend his reading beyond the confines of his particular calling, he will probably find it for his interest to do so, inasmuch as it will strengthen his capacity, enlarge his views, and qualify him for a general intercourse with society, and a reputable standing in it. Eminence in any profession or branch of knowledge, however, is, without doubt, only to be attained by an almost exclusive devotion to that profession or branch of knowledge, in all the ways of reading, thinking, and actual practice. A man can become a thorough master, we presume, on no other terms, than by acquainting himself with all that is already known and published on his subject, and by determining to find out all that there is to be known. The first he must accomplish by reading, and the second by reflection and experiment; and though books cannot take the place and answer in stead of experiment, yet they are often useful in teaching us, by hints and principles and precedents, how to conduct experiment.

Books will furthermore give us a considerable insight into human character, and join with experience in teaching us a knowledge of the world. There is a common notion, that books cannot impart this kind of knowledge, and that a

student must necessarily be unacquainted with the varieties of character, or, at any rate, unable to discern them in real life. As applied to students of very recluse habits, and to those men of very simple minds, who, whether students or not, would always be liable to deception in the thronged world, this notion is correct; but to any greater extent we believe it to be wholly false. We believe that a person who knows books, will know men sooner and more thoroughly, on mixing with them, than one who has had no such preparation; because we believe, and indeed know, that there are many books in which men are painted to the life; and to tell us that we do not learn something of mankind from such books, is the same thing as telling us that we have learnt nothing of a face, after we have been examining a portrait of it by the hand of a master. There are many particulars of deportment in our intercourse with society, many pleasant graces, and many minute but useful items of behaviour, which, it is granted, books cannot teach. Nor can they teach human character and the world, in hardly any respect, so thoroughly, alone, as in connexion with experience. But it is altogether idle to say, that books can furnish not a drop of that knowledge of character and knowledge of the world, of which so many of them are confessedly full to the brim. There is, however, a certain kind of knowledge of the world; a practical acquaintance with low characters, low tricks, and low vices, scenes of excess, and haunts of profligacy, which books, unless they are of the vilest description, do not pretend to teach. But although this is a kind of knowledge, on which some have the effrontery and folly to plume themselves, the acquisition of it can only be the object of a most pitiable ambition. It almost inevitably degrades the mind and sensualizes the heart. It is a knowledge of the world, in short, which makes those, who are adepts in it, worldly and criminal; a knowledge, which every wise man, instead of coveting, will most heartily eschew — evincing his wisdom by choosing to remain in ignorance. This kind of knowledge excepted, then, a knowledge of the world is certainly to be obtained from reading. We do not say that a perfect or intimate knowledge is to be so obtained, but a knowledge of the same sort with that which we obtain of a coast from charts, or of buildings from views, ground-plans, and elevations.

These remarks, few as they are, may be sufficient to show the importance of books to the character of society, and their value to individuals in their connexions with society; and we have before spoken of their uses in filling up our solitary hours, and increasing domestic happiness. To man by himself, and to man in his family and social relations, they constitute an inestimable treasure, from which may be drawn continual supplies to meet the demands of our nature, and the calls and exigencies of life.

Let it not be said, that we are recommending luxuries, which require more money for their purchase, and more time for their perusal, than multitudes can afford. Once, books were luxuries, which the wealthy only could procure. That time has passed away, and books are luxuries no longer, except as all excellent things are luxuries, whether cheap or dear. There are few persons, very few, who have health and ability to do any thing for their living, who cannot procure books, if they are only inclined to read them. He who wants them, will find little or no difficulty in obtaining them. Public and circulating libraries are open, from which they may be hired at an expense which almost any member of the community would consider trifling, if devoted to personal ornament or animal gratification. Book-auctions occur so frequently in our cities, that if one has time to attend only a few of them, and sense to bid only for what is really good, and what he really wants, he may soon buy a small library at a small cost. And if he goes to the regular booksellers' shops, which, after all, is the best and least dangerous way, as the waste of time, and risk of purchasing trash and refuse, and other perils of auctions will thereby be avoided, he may furnish himself, so cheaply are books now printed, with neat and correct editions of truly valuable works, for sums which he may earn, or save, in a little while, by moderate exertion or self-denial. Forty or fifty cents will purchase the poems of Burns, or Campbell, or Paradise Lost, or a half-volume of the Library of Entertaining Knowledge, to instance these only out of many; so that books which improve the understanding, taste, and heart, may gradually be accumulated in a man's closet, to entertain and inform his leisure hours, and prove not the least among the permanent comforts of his life, if he will only now and then forego some shortlived pleasure, which perhaps is as hurtful in its effects as it is fleeting in its duration.

With respect to the wealthy, and those who are in easy circumstances, it seems to be their duty to buy books, we had almost said, whether they intend to read them or not. A house is never properly furnished, unless it contains one well filled bookcase, at least; and if it is a house of any pretensions, it ought to have its library, and that not merely a nominal library. A remark which we once heard a friend make concerning pictures, may be made with yet more force concerning books, — they show that the owner of them has something else besides wealth. There is no excuse for a man of any property who keeps his dwelling bare of books, in an age when for a sum which was formerly paid for a copy of the Scriptures, or a portion of the works of Cicero, he may line the side of a room with the best works in all languages.

The great difficulty with regard to books, is, not their scarcity or their costliness, for they are plenty enough and cheap enough. Whoever loves them, and has a due sense of their value, will find that he can afford to buy at least a few of them; and he who is possessed of common discretion in affairs, will take care not to buy too many. The great difficulty consists in a proper selection of them. There are bad books as well as good ones; vile, detestable books, calculated to inflame the passions, or throw fuel to their fires; to mislead the judgment, or encourage it in error; to pervert the principles, or confirm them in their perversion; books which are the rehearsals of the follies, vices, and excesses of those who write them, and who have the impudence to repeat such things to the deluded world, not as shames and warnings, but as exploits and examples. The cost of such books is the least damage which they inflict on their purchasers. At any price, or no price, they would be dear, when you come to calculate the time which is lost in reading them, to say nothing of the probable and still greater loss of purity and principle. He who brings such books into his house, introduces robbers there. He had better, if necessary, bribe them to keep away, than hire them to come in. They will plot to take his most valuable property from him, — ay, his very life. Here lies the difficuly, we say, the choice which is to be made between deadly enemies and precious friends.

In the characters of books, as in the characters of men, there are many gradations, as might be supposed from the

fact, that books are but copies of the thoughts, affections, and imaginings of men. As it is for our interest to have good men for our friends and advisers, it is equally so to choose good books for the companions of our reading hours; and as we should shun idle or vicious associates, so ought we to avoid vain, seductive, and unprincipled writings. But, as we have said, there are gradations in the characters of books and men; and as there are gradations of excellence, so there are of iniquity in both.

There are books, and vast quantities of them too, which are merely worthless; and of which nothing worse can be said, than that time is absolutely thrown away upon them. This is the case with books of several different classes and descriptions, but especially so of the class of novels and romances. Far be it from us to pass an unreserved censure on all books which go under that name. Sir Walter Scott, and Miss Edgeworth, to mention no others, ought to arrest such a condemnation from any lips, and turn it into words of thankfulness and applause. It is nevertheless true that there is an enormous mass of works of fiction published here, and a yet more enormous mass abroad, which are utter trash, chaff, inanity; which are no further wicked than they wickedly consume the time of their readers, and have a tendency to keep those minds weak, which are weak enough in the first place to be engaged by their vapid nonsense, dismally empty and barren as they are of all information, of all good sense, and of all wit. Let such books, as they are merely worthless, be merely treated with neglect. Nothing is to be gained from their society, and all the time which is spent in it is completely lost.

Of a far deeper die of guilt are those works, which, while they render themselves fascinating and popular by the genius and talent which they display, produce baneful and deadly effects by the reckless and unprincipled spirit which pervades them. You see in such books a lurking sneer at faith and purity which is worse than bold infidelity. You see a specious beauty thrown round the forms of profligacy which has no business there, and does not in fact belong there. You see a fop made a hero, or a robber made a hero, in such a way as to deceive, enamour, and lead astray those who are ready to take for their hero any thing which perverted talent will present to them as such. These books give false views

of life, joy, and glory; deluding and destructive views of human action and character. Their influence is that of intoxication. They should be firmly denounced and condemned.

Of yet another description are those books, which are calculated to inflame those passions of our nature which are always ready to smoke and burn, and burst into excess, and which it is the part of reason and virtue to control and regulate, and not to incite. It is sometimes said in defence of such books, that they express and describe nothing which does not actually take place in the world, and has not an existence in the thoughts and bosoms of men. But because there are things which actually take place and exist, are we to receive pictures of all those things, and hang them up in our houses; or is he guiltless who paints them? Is it necessary, because there is sin and death in the world, that we should keep their forms embalmed in our studies and chambers? Is it safe thus to court infection? Have we not temptations enough, that we must voluntarily increase them? Must we harbour, not our own failings alone, but take the sins and lusts of others home to live with us, and thus make our last state worse than the first? What is meant then by the plea, that because vice is, we must therefore read and contemplate it, and that too in all the most seductive dresses with which it pleases abused and degraded genius to clothe it? It is not strange that licentiousness should defend and excuse itself by sophistry, but it is astonishing that such sophistry should be so effective as we often find it to be.

They whose duty, profession, or inclination it is to make themselves acquainted in some degree with all literature, must read, it is to be presumed, all manner of books, so far as to form some estimate of their character and be able to express an opinion concerning them. There is no call even upon them, however, to peruse some books which there are, of the very vilest description, which are so disreputably and unquestionably bad, that they are obliged to hide themselves, and creep about in darkness, and which challenge no opinion. But it is for the unspeakable interest of others, who have only a certain portion of time to give to reading, and can only read a definite number of volumes, to kill no hour of that time, and expose themselves to no temptation and spiritual danger, by dwelling on pages which they have reason to believe are

worthless, or of immoral tendency and influence. And all good men, and well-wishers to the peace and purity of society, ought to unite in forming a public opinion strong and decided enough to put such books down, and impose silence upon them.

An enlightened public opinion, however, is, we are fully convinced, the only force which ought to be employed to put down improper and dangerous publications, with the exception of those of the very worst character, against which, perhaps, the terrors of the law should be directed. Public opinion is, in fact, the only force which can put them down effectually; the only power which can banish those already existing from general society and favor, and check, if not prevent, the lawless invasions of future hosts and hordes of them upon the public weal. Penal statutes, restraints on the liberty of the press, the appointment of a system of licensing, will not answer the purpose. In an age and country like ours, people will not bear such impositions; and in darker times and lands those books are the most likely to be outlawed, which are the best calculated to disperse the darkness and overthrow the power of interested men. 'To choose a good book,' says Dr. Aikin, 'look into an inquisitor's prohibited list.' A correct moral taste and sentiment in the community, made correct by reflection, by comparison, by freedom, and by religion, will be the best prohibition of bad books. The man of pure moral feeling will prohibit them his company and friendship. The father and the mother will prohibit them the society of their children, and forbid them their house. Instructers of youth will prohibit them all intercourse with their pupils. Rulers, and governors, and elders will prohibit them their countenance. All who are interested in the public security and virtue, will, by a serious and fearless expression of their opinions, unawed by fashion, authority, or ridicule, prohibit them the favor of all within their influence.

The more this subject is considered, the more important it will seem in the eyes of reflecting men. We hardly know of a duty more incumbent on those, who, from any circumstances of situation, are able to affect the sentiments, the resolutions, the course of thinking and reading of others, than judiciously, firmly, and always with rendering a reason for it, to set their faces against the dispersion and favorable reception of

immoral books. There are those who have the power, not of law, or place, or station, but of truth and right, to sink a brand on the forehead of books, whether of disguised or open profligacy, whether stealing or rushing upon society, as the Adventures of a Gentleman, or the Adventures of a Highwayman, so that they may be known for what they are, and duly estimated, and speedily exiled and forgotten. And with this power they have another, which they also ought sedulously to exert, the power of recommending good books; the power of diffusing knowledge, both useful and entertaining; the power of purifying and elevating the taste, of increasing the wisdom and confirming the virtue of the community. This power, in various degrees, belongs not only to the legislator, the magistrate, the teacher of youth, the minister of the gospel, but to every master and mistress of a family, to every respectable man and woman, to every individual who has at heart the safety of those who are dear to him, the good of society, the interests of religion, the honor of human nature, the glory of God; to every one who knows light from darkness, good from evil, his right hand from his left. If all who have this power were conscious of it, and regarded it as a sacred trust, and would resolve to use it, what might not be expected from its goings forth? If all who possess it, would join together, not in formal associations, but in the unity of a holy spirit and a righteous cause, to exert it, why would it not be irresistible? We wish that every good man was sensible of his power, even the power of goodness, and would learn how to exercise it over opinion, unostentatiously but honestly. We wish that every man who can tell a good book from a bad one, and prefers the good to the bad, would let his preference be known and felt; and that no such man would buy or read, borrow or lend a foolish or immoral book, whoever might be its author, or whatever might be its subject or style. Every single opinion is important; for it is the aggregated weight of opinions which must finally decide the character of literature. And let it be remembered that literature is an exchangeable commodity, and is exchanged widely and freely. The character and spirit of the literature of one country, have an effect on the reading population, and through them on the whole population of another country. As lovers of our country, then, as real patriots, it should be our earnest prayer and endeavour,

both that our national literature should be colored as little as possible with foreign impurities, and that its own stream should be so pure and clear of itself, as to carry none but the waters of healing and life to the ends of the habitable earth.

ART. VIII. — *An Essay on Junius and his Letters; embracing a Sketch of the Life and Character of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, and Memoirs of certain other Distinguished Individuals; with Reflections Historical, Personal, and Political, relating to the Affairs of Great Britain and America, from* 1763 *to* 1785. By BENJAMIN WATERHOUSE, M. D., Member of several Medical, Philosophical, and Literary Societies in Europe and America. Boston. Gray & Bowen. 1831. 8vo. pp. 449.

THE authorship of the Letters of Junius is well said to be 'the most artfully contrived secret of modern times.' For sixty years it has baffled the most diligent and cunning inquiry, and seems to be still as far from detection as ever. Many shrewd guesses have been made, and many ingenious hypotheses ingeniously defended; but no argument has yet been brought forward sufficiently guarded at all points to command the assent of the world. The man in the iron mask is known, and the writer of 'Ikon Basilike' has been dragged into day. But no one has been able to pull off the visor of Junius, or disperse the night in which he wrapt himself. Meantime, curiosity is not weary, and the investigation is going on with as much keenness as ever. It is not long since a volume on the subject was published in New York; a second made its appearance in Boston; a third we understand is in preparation in another place; and we have before us an ample essay from the pen of a veteran scholar, who, having lived through the whole period of the publication of the letters and the search for the writer, is enabled to speak like one engaged in the affairs and moving among the actors of a former generation. His candidate for the equivocal honor is Lord Chatham; and it is a little remarkable, that just as this work issues from the press, a pamphlet arrives from England supporting the same hypothesis.

To support this hypothesis, is not, however, as the reader may gather from the title-page of the volume, its only design. 'In the course of our discussion,' says the author, 'Junius may appear a primary or a secondary object; for the mere solution of a puzzling question is hardly worth the labor we shall probably bestow upon it.' Accordingly he illustrates every point of the subject by the collateral history of the times, and collects together a mass of instructive and entertaining story, relating alike to public affairs and individual character. In doing this, he treats particularly of the character and policy of George the Third, especially as affecting the fortunes of this country, and introduces many anecdotes and characters to illustrate the preliminary history of our independence. In fact, his book is a glance at the times, quite as much in their bearing upon the American question as upon the authorship of the Letters; and will be found full of pleasant things for those who love their country, though they may care nothing about Junius. We have no room to follow him over this wide range. We propose only a brief sketch of what he has done toward unravelling the great secret.

The suspicion that Chatham was the writer of these letters first arose in his mind, Dr. Waterhouse tells us, upon reading the singular eulogium on that nobleman in the fifty-fourth letter; a eulogy so strangely conceived and so awkwardly expressed, that it has perplexed all readers of the book, and given rise to the most various remarks. The supposition that Chatham himself wrote it, seemed to Dr. Waterhouse to solve the enigma, and render at once intelligible what is otherwise an unaccountable mystery.

In seeking confirmation of this conjecture, our author scrutinizes critically the history and character of the times, and the condition and fortunes of distinguished men, in order to learn who had been so placed as to gain the requisite minute acquaintance with affairs and men, who possessed the vehement and overbearing temper, the command of language, the motive to prompt him, the power to conceal himself, and a sufficient reason for inviolable and everlasting secrecy. All these postulates he seems to find in the Earl of Chatham. His vigor and impetuosity of mind were fully equal to what Junius exhibited, and his temper had the same character of overbearing and haughty sternness. The style of his

speeches, making due allowance for the superior elaborateness of the Letters, has the same strength, compression, and vehemence. Instances of the most remarkable resemblance, we had almost said identity, are quoted in the present work. He had always been conversant with public life, and had been in offices, for a long series of years, which would give him that commanding and intimate acquaintance with all the public and secret history of the court, and the government, and their agents, which has been thought so unaccountable. And at the time these letters were appearing, he was retired from public life, chagrined and disappointed, irritable through disease, though in the full vigor of his intellect. Does not such a description answer to the imaginary Junius? Is it improbable that such a man, so situated, should vent his anxious patriotism in expostulations and denunciations, such as we find in these letters? Have we not found in him the power to do, the occasion to call forth, the motive to excite, and the strong reason for secrecy?

Having thus stated the preliminary presumptions, Dr. Waterhouse proceeds a step further, and finds some striking coincidences which go to confirm him in his opinion. First, the date of the publication, which commenced within a few months after Chatham had withdrawn to his retirement. Next, the coincidence of sentiment in all matters of political importance. Again, and perhaps more strikingly still, the personal partialities and hostilities of both the great known and the great unknown. They had the same enmities and the same friendships. When we observe the rancor with which Chatham pursued Lord Mansfield on all occasions, even to his last dying speech, we can hardly help seeing in it the same unrelenting virulence with which Junius assailed that distinguished judge. When we read too his vituperation of Bedford and Grafton, we find the causes of it in the history of Pitt's connexion with those noblemen; while his tenderness and respect for Camden, Holland, and others, are displayed to the intimate and confidential friends of Chatham. To understand the force of these allusions, one must go into particulars for which we have no room, and for which we refer to the work before us.

But beyond all this, there are some singular agreements between certain letters of Junius and certain speeches of Lord Chatham, altogether inexplicable upon any other sup-

position. These agreements relate both to the current of thought, the character of the illustrations, and the use of peculiar expressions and phrases. More than forty pages of the volume are occupied with these parallel passages; and we think that one might read on page after page, taking care to cover the name affixed to each passage, without being able to determine, from any difference of manner, when he was reading Junius and when Chatham. These coincidences had before been noticed by the author of 'Junius Identified'; to whom they appeared so remarkable, that he said, 'either Lord Chatham was the author of the Letters, or Junius reported Lord Chatham's speeches.' Upon this hint he built up the hypothesis, that Sir Philip Francis, the reporter of the speeches, was the writer of the Letters. Is it strange that Dr. Waterhouse has thought it more probable that the same person was the author of both? Especially as he thus avoids the fatal objection to the other, perhaps to every other, hypothesis, that sometimes the letter precedes in point of time the delivery of the speech; requiring us to suppose that Chatham borrowed of Francis, as well as Francis of Chatham.

There is a multitude of more minute considerations adduced by our author in confirmation of his conjecture. We may just hint at three of them. First, the air of easy equality with which Junius addresses the highest in rank, indicates a person familiar with title and state. This has been noticed even by his bitterest enemies, as 'the air and authority of a great personage in disguise.' Secondly, the incidental indications of advancing age which peep out here and there. Both these are certainly suitable to the pretensions of Chatham. Thirdly, Dr. Waterhouse being persuaded that it was impossible for any man to effect this difficult and delicate task alone, has a pleasant and ingenious chapter to show, that his help must have been that of bosom friends. He introduces us to Chatham's family, paints to us his accomplished wife and sister, and makes us believe that they knew and aided his plans. He finds a hint of their feminine zeal in the following sentence from one of Junius's private letters to Woodfall; 'The truth is, there are people about me, whom I wish not to contradict, and who would rather see Junius in the papers ever so improperly, than not at all.' Now, says Dr. Waterhouse, certainly these people were *women*. And

this supposition is strengthened by the hand-writing of the manuscripts, which, with one exception, 'is like that which well educated ladies wrote about the beginning of the century.'

We do not pretend to enter into this question, nor to suggest nor remove the difficulties by which this hypothesis is attended. There is another point to which we prefer calling our readers' attention; we mean the *character* of these letters, which, no less than their origin, is a subject of deep interest, and in our view of superior importance. Their literary merit will not be disputed. It perhaps has been exaggerated, for the mystery and other circumstances attending them, have caused them to be viewed in any rather than that calm state of feeling which is favorable to the right appreciation of their merits. Their *moral* character and tendency is more doubtful. They may have been the offspring of virtuous patriotism; but they certainly have the features of a more private and less honorable parentage. In assigning them to the great Chatham, Dr. Waterhouse pleads, that we are to transfer to them his integrity and pure love of country; and understand as expressions of virtuous indignation, and zeal for the public good, what, under other circumstances, might be interpreted into private malice, and personal resentment. He argues, too, that there is no better reason for condemning as unjustifiable and immoral the unsparing severity of Junius, than that of Juvenal and Pope. Why should not he be placed in the same class with those distinguished satirists? and why should the difference between writing in poetry and writing in prose, take from him an honor which is allowed to them, or afford them an apology of which he may not avail himself? Satire is still satire; and should have the same laws and equal privileges in all cases.

But whatever weight may be allowed to suggestions like these, there is one solemn truth, which cannot be winked out of sight, and which causes us to look back to the labors of this successful politician with feeling of the deepest sorrow and reprobation. We refer to their consequences. His eloquence and success have consecrated and made honorable the profession of masked writers; have made reputable secret assassination of character; have done more than any thing to render current the pernicious notion, that he who con-

ceals his name is less bound by the principles of honor and veracity; and have encouraged disappointed men and unprincipled partisans to vent their personal pique, their love of slander, their dislike of the good, in unacknowledged vituperation and exaggerated abuse, under the idea that they were imitators of the great Junius. We verily believe, that the present prostituted and irresponsible condition of the anonymous press, is owing in a large measure to the admiration which has followed that extraordinary man; and when we observe to what extent that prostitution has been carried, and how fearfully it treads under foot all that is honorable in political principle and all that is just and amiable in Christian intercourse, we have no words to express our sense of the evil, or our grief at the source from which it sprung. Let attention be given to this thing. How is it that men, too often those who profess to be engaged in exalted designs, and who in private intercourse are punctiliously honorable and gentlemanly in their treatment of all, are so apt to throw off their moral sense and forget their moral responsibility, the moment they write for the public journals; and allow themselves in looseness of statement, indecorous personality, and paltry disingenuousness, by which they would feel themselves disgraced if they had used them in any other relation? How is it that the public mind allows this? How has it come to be imagined, that to put on a mask and stab in the dark takes away responsibility and criminality? How is it that a mean and malignant coward is permitted with impunity to conceal himself behind a fictitious name, and pour out through the public press his venomous insinuations, his rancorous vituperation, poisoning the public mind and blasting private reputation? Why should virtue and worth be at the mercy of these hidden archers, who shoot envenomed arrows in malice or in sport, and the general sentiment of an outraged community not rise indignantly against them?

There is something wrong in this thing. The anonymous press needs purifying and reform. There must be responsibility somewhere. The individual must not be merged in the writer. He and the public must learn to feel, that, instead of being absolved from the strictness of truth and the decorum of common life when he thus speaks in the ear of the world, he is rather to be regarded as under a more solemn

pledge to observe them, — as a witness on the stand, testifying upon oath. We know no other rule which strict virtue can allow, nor under which society can be safe. The press is the great agent of modern times — incalculable in its power for good and for evil. It may fill the atmosphere of society with truth or falsehood at its pleasure. It may create or destroy a salutary public opinion. What disasters must not await us, if it be surrendered into the hands of incompetent or unprincipled men, if it be unrestricted by the laws of truth and religion, if the base feel that it is theirs, and none can call them to account. Already the annals of our political and theological warfare give ominous tokens of the ruin which is to be feared. Let the friends of their country awake, and insist that veracity and decorum shall characterize the columns of party discussion. Let the friends of religion and the church resolutely frown upon every attempt to turn the pages of religious instruction into vehicles of personal defamation, and to shield sophistical and disingenuous discussion from rebuke by concealment of authorship. Let a strong and active public opinion insist, that every man shall be responsible for what he writes, as well as for what he does; and compel every man to the same decorum, propriety, and truth, in speaking from the press, which are required in the personal intercourse of gentlemen and Christians in civilized society.

[For the Christian Examiner.]

Art. IX. *The Way of Truth and Union.*

There are so many whose feelings or habits of thought incline them to take discouraging views of the progress of their faith, that it is well to state the fact at times, that no power can offer any permanent resistance to the truth; and that their confidence in the success must be in proportion to their confidence in the truth of their opinions. In this sacred cause the weakest hands are strong; not so on the other side; though many may be blinded, though many live and die in delusion, still the cause of truth advances. The

defenders of the right may be discouraged for a season, — obstacles may withstand it, as the ice bars the course of some Alpine river; but their only effect is to send it on with a broader sweep and a deeper energy, when it bursts triumphantly through. All who have just ideas of the nature of truth, look forward with perfect confidence to this result. The world has seen men, advocates of truths less inspiring than those of religion, who have showed what this great confidence will do. When the world with one voice denied the truths they endeavoured to impress; when lover and friend were far from them; when even the wise advised them to forbear; when they felt that they could hardly spread their light further than the lamp, with which they pursued their labors; — they kept on with a courage that nothing could depress, and showed how the weakness of human nature is raised in power when sustained by principle and duty. There has been many an apostle of Christianity, too, who has expressed a similar confidence, when there seemed little hope for the cause he had at heart; — he was like an ancient prophet who in the strength of God had foretold some mighty change; the incredulous began to triumph and the timid to despair; no cloud in the heaven gave sign of the storm, — still the noble prophet persevered, waiting with a heart that never faltered till the predicted hour was come.

This confidence is not surprising, when we remember what truth is; it is not something arbitrary, changing, and capricious; it is not formed by invention, nor does it depend on argument; it exists, whether it is acknowledged or not, whether it is perceived or not, being wholly independent of the consent of men. It is important to remember this, because we are apt to speak of it as if it were an invention rather than a discovery, — as if it were a system framed and communicated to the world by Jesus Christ. But he only revealed to men what was truth in itself, — what would have been truth, even though he had never existed. And thus with all the messengers of Heaven. The truths which they communicated were not new, though they were new to men. One by one they lifted the veil from the works of God; each raised it higher than the one who came before him, till at last it was torn away as by the lightning shining from the west to the east, when our Saviour came into the world.

They no more invented new truths than the discoverers of planets added new orbs to the sky; they only measured their periods and revolutions, and declared to men that what seemed like bright points, were actually worlds rolling above them; but there they had rolled from the beginning of creation. So the truths which successively open on the human mind have been shining with equal brightness from the earliest time to the present hour, though their magnitude and importance were unknown.

From this it is plain that there is no such thing as establishing a system of truth such as creeds pretend to embody, because they can do nothing more than collect all the information possessed by the world on the subject of religious truth; and at the very time when they are formed, the world is gaining new accessions of information, unless it is greatly negligent of its duty. For the same reason, the cause of those who contend against it is hopeless; for it is not like arguing against an opinion. Those who engage in such an enterprise are compelled to blind the eyes which would otherwise see, to flatter men in their old delusions, and to force them to wear garments which they are constantly tending to outgrow. There never was a more false and scandalous libel on human nature than to say that men do not love the truth; they are liable enough to delusion, but they cling to delusion because it seems to them to be truth, and they resist the reformer because he seems to be urging them to cast the truth away. Certain it is, that they who resist the truth fight against nature. The advocates of truth have no occasion to resort to constraint, because they know that as soon as the eye of the world opens, the truths they uphold will be seen. The partisans of error, on the contrary, in all generations, have resorted to constraint and oppression, because they knew that men desired the truth and would come to the knowledge of it, if not prevented. Thus they have paid a compliment to human nature, while they wronged it; for men do not fetter those who do not wish to be free.

Those who now endeavour to discover the truth, are placed at disadvantage for their purpose; because the information given by revelation with respect to divine and eternal truths, is not to be found, in the state in which our Saviour left it, any where except in the Scriptures; and they go to them with a thousand prejudices and imaginations. Instead of

endeavouring to ascertain the precise nature and limits of the information which Scripture gives on these subjects, they set themselves to embellish it, like one who turns the accounts, given by travellers, of foreign countries, into materials for romantic fiction instead of enlightening instruction. The whole army of religious errors have been formed by adding to the truth revealed. There is a sort of passion for adding to what is written. It is easier to make men embrace ten new errors than to make them give up one. Unless a man is very enlightened, he does not like the heavenly simplicity so well as the mysteries made by man. If any thing can be added to these truths, he receives it gladly for the same reason that he wishes to see human power and splendor thrown round the native dignity of virtue, and this process goes on till the truth is buried and lost under what he considers its robes and decorations.

From this view of the nature of religious truth, and the way in which errors are formed, we may see that the friends of truth have not always taken the right course to save themselves from discouragement or to effect their purposes. They could have found no better direction than that of an Apostle; 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.' To examine and cast hastily away that which is not good, will not do; we must examine the bad thing to see if there is not some good in it; and if there is, we must reject the bad and apply the good to good uses. The most corrupt heart that ever existed, if the corruptions could be cast away, would be a fit dwelling for religion; and the same is true of corrupt doctrines, which, being raised by the imagination upon the true doctrines of the gospel, need rather to be purified than cast away. We know that there are many which seem so utterly revolting, so directly opposed to sense and reason, so plainly contradicted in the word of God, that it is hard to have patience with them, or to treat them as any thing better than pure inventions. Still they are corruptions rather than inventions, and are built on some foundation of truth, however small. If we chase the lying slander that passes through a community, and strip it of the additions it has gathered in passing from tongue to tongue, we find, that false as it is, there is under it all a slender basis of truth. The same is the case with the false doctrines of religion. Those who have been struck with some religious truth, have exalted and

embellished it, till the truth bore no proportion to the falsehood. It is like the hero-worship of old time, by which distinguished men, were by slow accessions of flattery, exalted into gods. Now what is to be done with such doctrines? Are we to condemn them at once and altogether? Are we to scorn the understandings of those who hold them? We are, on the contrary, bound to examine our own and to urge others to examine theirs, for the purpose of rejecting all that is false about them and treasuring all that is good. It is not the love of truth, it is passion, that condemns in the wholesale manner; it is good sense that directs us to examine before we condemn. The child casts away the ore in which the metal is hid; the man tries it in the fire, and rough and coarse as it seems, the bright stream soon runs below.

We may take a few doctrines once popular, and still preached, though with less confidence than formerly, to show that whatever they may be now, they were founded on a small basis of truth. The doctrine of election, for example, — the doctrine that some are elected to eternal life, and others just as good, if not better, abandoned to despair, and all for no reason whatever. The whole heart cries out against that doctrine, the iniquity and horror of which cannot be overstated. We reject it with loathing, as if it were an insult to the majesty of Heaven even to ask if it is true. Still the doctrine of election is a doctrine of the Scriptures; and all this contradiction and folly has arisen, not from believing in election, but from not asking what it means. On examination we find that the Jews were a people elected to enjoy uncommon privileges in their day; and that after them Christians became a chosen people, — elected to enjoy uncommon privileges. That bodies of men should be called to inherit blessings denied to others, is not unjust, any more than that individuals should be elected to wealth, honor, and power, because 'to whom much is given, of him shall much be required.' Christians are yet to answer for all that has been given; and perhaps the poor heathen who has improved the light given him, may stand higher than they in the kingdom of heaven. Such is the simple truth from which the vast fiction called the doctrine of election has grown.

Again, we hear it said that works are of no importance — no helps or means to salvation. When we hear this doctrine advanced, it strikes us as unrighteous and immoral, and we

say at once, that if the Scriptures came to tell us that we can gain nothing by good deeds, and lose nothing by immorality, they are any thing rather than a guide and blessing to the world. But the doctrine that works are no proof of holiness is a doctrine of the Scriptures. The apostles have filed their solemn testimony against them. And what were they? They were, as we see in the Scriptures, the works of the law — the old Hebrew law, — the forms, penances, and devotions, by which many Jewish Christians, misled by their early education, were vainly hoping to conciliate God, and which were in fact no better evidence of religious character, than the long prayers, sudden conversions, and religious services, attended at the expense of domestic duties, which are so common at the present day. It is true, indeed, and it cannot be too often stated, that by such works as these, no flesh ever was, or ever will be, justified in the sight of God. But *good* works are a very different thing, and so far from being unessential to the religious character, they *are* the character. Jesus Christ charged his apostles to let the world see their good works, and the apostles repeated to the churches the charge to maintain good works; so that while works, so called, were treated with contempt, as the resort of superstition and hypocrisy, good works were held up as the ground of Christian character in the present life, and of salvation in the life to come.

To mention another example; we are sometimes shocked with hearing it said, that the greatest sinner is nearest the kingdom of heaven. Used as we are to all manner of religious extravagance, and this among the rest, it startles us as often as we hear it, and we ask if any man in his senses can believe that the murderer is nearer heaven — in a safer and more desirable position, than the man of regular life, who has never given countenance to sin, even though he has never been interested in religion. The doctrine, in its exaggerated form, is evidently little better than a falsehood. Sill it has a slender basis of truth; and the truth is, that the guilty is more within the reach of alarm, more likely to be wrought upon by a feeling of his danger, than he who is free from open and presumptuous sins, and yet never, from one year to another, thinks seriously of eternity or of God.

The doctrine of sudden conversion, as it is often preached, is yet another illustration. It would seem that the wretch

can throw off the burden of his sins at once, that he can pass in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, from the condition of a guilty, self-condemning man, into the peace and excellence of the sons of God. Now we know that there can be no such changes in our moral nature, and that if they were possible, Christianity is neither suited nor intended to produce them. There is truth under all the shadow of this delusion, and the truth is, that the Christian character must have a beginning,—in childhood or in age there must be a time when the religious principle begins to act in the heart. The error consists in taking that which is nothing more than a beginning, for a real and thorough change,—in taking the commencement for the perfection. And thus a thousand deluded beings have been dazzled by the first dawning of religious principle in their souls, and have triumphed in the cold daybreak as if it were the perfect day.

These will serve as examples of the manner in which religious errors and corruptions are associated in men's minds with the truth, in such a manner as often to hide the truth from their eyes. The eclipsing shadow makes no part of the truth; the inventions of men cannot affect the reality, but they may prevent us from discerning it, as the small obstacle just before our eyes sometimes hides the whole heaven from our view.

If it be admitted that there is truth at the bottom of most errors, it is clear that we are not required to cast away, so much as to purify opinions. We are to cast away all the error, and retain all the truth. There are not many whose religious opinions were first formed from the Scriptures. We receive them from the guardians of our childhood and youth; we hear them expressed in the earliest language we learn to understand; and from often hearing them insisted upon with deep solemnity by those whom we reverence, they become venerable and sacred in the soul. To come to a man whose faith is thus engraven on his heart, and tell him that it is all falsehood, shocks him; he stops his ears to all argument, and the mildest thing that can be said seems to him like a libel on religion; when, had he been requested not to give up but purify his opinions, he might have gradually come over to the truth. We must not complain of this; for it springs from a good feeling. It is natural that man should resist innovation, as he would resist the hand that would cut

down the groves and level the hills where his childhood played. This feeling defends the truth at least as often as it opposes it; and that it insists on strong evidence in favor of the reform is no hardship, since truth always has such arguments to bring.

But some will say, where is the mighty difference? It is all the difference between asking a man to reform his son, and asking him to disinherit him. If you ask him to look to the character and feelings of his child, and to do all he can to form him for respectability and usefulness, he will thank you for the kind interest you express. But if you go to him to tell him that his child is utterly abandoned, and that he owes it to himself and society to drive him from his door, he will hate you, he will curse you. The difference is almost the same between asking a man to purify, and asking him to cast away his opinions. He loves them; they are like the green shade over the fountain whence the healing waters flow. Habit has made them familiar, familiarity has made them dear. Those who have reasoned themselves into their opinions cannot understand how the soul clings to sentiments which were planted, watered, and cherished in it by a parent's love.

We are confirmed by all experience in this view of the subject. When was a man ever converted by one who attempted to make him renounce his opinions? when did a fierce conflict of personal argument ever result in conviction to either side? who ever saw the controvertist who was not casehardened in his opinions? We attribute too much to controversy, if we believe that it changes men's opinions. All it has done or can do is to direct men's attention to the subject. They go to their Bible; they read with a desire to know the truth; as they read, one error after another falls like scales from their eyes, while the truth remains unaltered. This is the reason that many who have entirely forsaken their former sentiments, will not allow that they are altered. They have not changed but purified them. They still hold fast all that was good; and what was good was the most important part before. They talked of and defended their errors, but they felt and were governed by the truth; now they have cast away the errors, they love the same truth still.

This view of the subject shows us how we may expect

truth to prevail. It is not by convincing men at large that their system is false, and inducing them to cast it away; no; truth can only spread by awakening a spirit of inquiry. If the minds of men can be brought to this; if they can be led to the Scripture, the purpose of truth is answered. Let them read it without partiality and without passion; let them only determine to know what God has taught them; and we do not say that *our* faith will prevail, but we are sure that the truth will. If our counsel be not of God, it cannot prevail. We do not wish that it should. We are aware that, when we say this, we must not expect to be joined by those who require to be frightened into their opinions; let them go; for we still say, if there is any faith better and purer than ours, any that brings better evidence, any that has a better effect upon human character and feeling, God grant that ours may sink to its foundation, whatever feelings of pride or partiality may be crushed by its fall.

But the advocates of truth wish to see something rapid and striking in its success. True, it is less sublime to see it spreading silently heart by heart, than to see multitudes with folded hands bowing down before it. It is less sublime to see some broad river unchained by the gentle influences of spring, than to see it lift its icy pavement with a thunder-crash and dash its fragments down the stream; but in one case property, life, and happiness are endangered, in the other it floats harmlessly away. To spread itself in the quick and violent way is not the nature of truth; error only is tumultuous and loud. Whenever men act suddenly and strongly, they are more or less governed by passion; and just in proportion as passion rises, principle is in danger of giving way. Every man who knows what truth is, and desires to see it spread surely as well as fast; every man who feels how soon the best excitement dies away; every man who looks on truth as the power of God, desires to see it pass over the world, not like the hurricane that makes whole forests bend, but like the gentle breeze that bears healing in its wings to nature and to man.

We may take courage then, when we see the advocates of various systems begin to prove them, resolving to hold fast what is good. We may take courage now; for if this is the way with truth, it is advancing now in the only manner which can lead to any lasting and happy results. We hear

the friends of different systems softening their language, explaining away their offensive expressions, and showing a consciousness in their whole manner, that a spirit is awakened which can neither be trifled with nor withstood. They who once gave over infants to damnation, now repel the charge as an insult and a slander. They who once preached personal election to eternal life, now begin to talk about works and human liberty. They who once insisted on the total depravity of man, now sink it to what all believe, that man is born with passions which will make him corrupt if not resisted. They who once threw contempt on human reason, now endeavour to gain its verdict in favor of their own opinions. The walls of churches that lately rang with wild and stormy condemnation, now begin faintly to whisper sounds of peace. Every sect is purging its floors and gathering its wheat into the garner. We know not how the prospect before us could be more encouraging than it is. If we wish for a sure rather than a sudden conversion of men to the cause of truth, we shall rejoice at the course which the world has taken; for should the besom of destruction pass over errors all at once, there is great danger that it might not only sweep religious corruptions but religious principle itself away; as too often happens with those who suddenly alter their convictions.

And now we say that no party, not even the party of truth, if such an one there be, must expect that others will come suddenly over to its name or to its numbers. Though they may cast away what is bad from their opinions, they will hold fast what is good. Let them hold it; let them remain in the temples where their fathers worshipped God; let them only open hospitable doors and clear the dust from their windows; if they only acknowledge the substantial truth and agree to let others alone, we deem it of small importance what dialect they speak, by what name they are distinguished, what banner they raise, or what livery they wear; they have done all we can ask of them, if we are pleading the cause of truth,— more than we have any right to ask, if we are pleading the cause of party. This is the way in which Christians will at last come together,— by each sect proving its doctrines, and holding fast that which is good. Had we any divining-rod for the purpose, we could see that the living waters of truth are springing under the errors of every

party. By this they will at last flow together, each retaining its names and forms, if it cannot let them go, but all feeling the influence of truth above all other. The unity of the spirit is all that we can hope for; this gained, the difference of forms is not of great importance; and the time will come, when the multitude of believers shall be, not of one sect or party, but of one heart and one soul.

NOTE.

In the notices, taken in this and a preceding number of the character and works of Robert Hall, we supposed we were writing of the living, and not of the dead; and from some accounts of his public services, of no distant date, we hoped, that this gifted and virtuous man was still actively engaged in a ministry, in which, with his whole mind and heart, he has so long and so ably served God and his generation. But from English journals, recently received, and since copied into some of our own, we learn, that he died in February last, after a violent illness of a few days. He was preparing for a public service in his own chapel, when he was seized with the return of a disorder, by which he had been before afflicted, and which so speedily terminated in his death.

The event was followed in Bristol, where he lived, and throughout England, with the grief, which his character might justly call forth. We need not here repeat, even did our limits permit, what has already been said of the extraordinary endowments and virtues of this great man. But there was one excellence in his character, to which we may just advert, and which, amidst the transcendent fame of his genius and eloquence, demands, for the benefit of the example, a peculiar notice. This was the *humility*, with which it was all united. His humbleness of mind, his simplicity of heart and manners, it is said, were maintained untouched amidst all his reputation. They are commemorated with special honors and with unequivocal marks of truth, by all his eulogists since his death. And when we consider the subduing power of fame; the odious and corrupting influence of the vanity it cherishes; when we see how soon and how fatally applauding crowds and the popular breath will spoil, in some of the noblest and the greatest, the very gifts that make them noble, we cannot but regard this trait in Robert Hall as the brightest jewel in his crown. It is the indication of that rare greatness of soul, that 'seeks not its glory from men,' in comparison of which even his high intellectual endowments appear with diminished lustre. May the influence of his labors and the example of his virtues be perpetual.

Errata.—*Page* 138, *line* 14, *for* sectarians, *read* Unitarians
" 192, " 10, " *Jan.* " *March*

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

No. XLV.

NEW SERIES — No. XV.

JULY, 1831.

ART. I. — *Vues sur le Protestantisme en France.* Par J. L. S. VINCENT, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Réformée de Nismes. 2 vol. Paris. 1829.

IT may be deemed ill-timed to enter into any speculations on the state of religion in France in the present excited and uncertain condition of political affairs in that country. When the events of the coming day can scarcely be predicted by the spectator on the spot, it must be presumed that we speak with diffidence on the prospects of religion. We do not possess the gift of looking through the stormy atmosphere into the scenes of the future; and at this distance from the warring elements of society in Europe, we will not venture to waste the time of our readers by the expression of our opinions or conjectures on the probable result of the present struggle. Of one thing, however, we may be certain. A new day has dawned upon Christianity in France. The religious spirit of the present age is far different from that which prevailed at the period of her first revolution. The light has arisen upon her, with omens of the happiest promise, but whether it will shine brighter and brighter unto the perfect day, or again be put back by a reign of terror and blood, we must leave to the mysterious Providence, which rules in the kingdoms of men.

'Forty years,' says Benjamin Constant, in the conclusion of his great work on Religion, 'forty years have passed

away since the triumph of an infidel philosophy at the epoch of the French Revolution. Where are we now? A mysterious agitation, a desire for religious faith, a longing for religious hope, are every where manifested. In all this, there is certainly some extravagance; but the extravagance is not without a cause. The motion, which succeeds apparent death, proves that the germ is not deprived of life.' The important work, from which we have quoted, written by one of the most able men, in politics and literature, of whom France can boast, is in itself a proof of the revival of religious ideas. That such a work, which is built on the reality of a spiritual religion and disinterested morality, and which assumes the truth of the Christian system as a philosophical fact, should proceed from the pen of a statesman and scholar, whose influence was felt in the cabinets of Europe, would have been pronounced incredible at the close of the last century. We have similar proofs of the progress of religious thought in other departments of French literature. Many of the most popular writings of the day breathe a pure religious spirit. Christian feelings and opinions are no longer deemed incompatible with a liberal mind and enlightened views. The most brilliant talents in society are divorced from their former unnatural union with infidelity and atheism. A scoffing derision of Christianity is not esteemed a necessary passport to good company. The most able periodical works are not infected with the licentious spirit of the last age; and, in many instances, bear frequent testimony to the truth and importance of the Christian religion. A great change has also taken place in the most important courses of public instruction. A spiritual and religious philosophy is now eloquently taught and received with the ardor of deep conviction by multitudes of the literary men of France, especially among the younger portions of the community, whose minds were not preöccupied with the barren systems of materialism, which had prevailed nearly to the entire exclusion of all others. The work which we are about to notice is a beautiful illustration of the new interest, awakened by religion, and, among many other discussions of great value and originality, contains a more perfect account of the present religious condition of France than any other source, which has come to our knowledge.

M. Vincent is a Christian and a Protestant. He views

his subjects in various lights, apparently with singular freedom from personal or sectarian prejudices, and constantly impresses us with the conviction of his perfect honesty and independence, as well as of his sound theological learning and deep piety. We do not propose to give any thing like a thorough analysis of his work, but merely to call our readers' attention to some of his statements and conclusions respecting the religious state of his own country. We premise, that for the facts and reasonings which follow we are indebted to M. Vincent, of whose views we aim only to give a faithful, but necessarily a brief and imperfect account.

The present religious movement, according to M. Vincent, is the natural consequence of the spirit that prevailed in France after the middle of the eighteenth century. That, also, was the result of errors and prejudices, which were established in a previous age. For several ages, religion had been under the dominion of the priesthood, and thus lost much of its intrinsic character. It had seized as a valuable prize many popular errors and superstitions, which it confounded with its own heavenly essence. It was burdened with a multitude of forms and observances, contrary to its real nature. It is not at all surprising, then, that by this means, the great doctrines of Christianity, and even the eternal duties of morality, should have been deprived of their spirit and life.

This corrupted system of religion could not be of long duration. It was too much opposed to human nature to withstand the progress of society in knowledge and civilization. It was impossible that man should not, sooner or later, awake to a sense of his own dignity after such degrading epochs. The crisis must come, and it did come. Men began to fathom their own natures; they interrogated their destiny and their faculties; they read the New Testament for themselves, and soon, in spite of the most violent opposition, in spite of all the arts of the pen, and the terrors of the sword, the triumph of two great truths was achieved, namely, that the priest is not the arbiter of religion, and that conscience is free, — and that religion does not consist in observances and forms, but in feelings and principles. This memorable triumph was called the Reformation. In the middle of the last century this triumph had reached to every country in Europe, and the two great truths, which

we have just named, were admitted by all enlightened men without dispute.

But the human mind, like physical forces, does not immediately stop, when its end is attained, but almost always goes beyond it, to return thither by a new course. So it was at this time. The wants of the age and the calls of truth were satisfied. They demanded that the huge and shapeless edifice, erected by the passions, the ignorance, and perhaps by the real necessities of the middle ages, on the solid and venerable foundations of Christianity, should be destroyed. This accordingly was done. But this was not enough. It was thought best to continue the labor and demolish the foundations themselves. Animated by the ardor of attack, intoxicated by a success which every day became more brilliant, many writers lost all their sensibility to the divine spirit which breathes in every page of the Gospel, and saw nothing in Christianity but the occasion and the support of the enormous abuses, under which human nature had so long groaned. They believed they were conferring a favor upon their fellow-men by destroying its influence, and making it an object of ridicule and contempt. As they had never studied it in its essential principles, but received it precisely as it had been left by the dark ages, with all the imperfections imposed upon it by the narrow spirit of the times, they believed they had destroyed it, and raised the cry of victory over its ruins, as soon as they found and signalized some inconsistencies and perhaps even errors in the Bible. This was an easy task. It was performed with talent, but not with impartiality. The very restraints, which these writers suffered from the civil authority, obliged them to make use of sly insinuations and artful hints, which gave their productions a more piquant relish, but deprived them of the gravity and seriousness with which subjects of this nature should always be treated.

They were not content with attacking Christianity. Mistaking the true character of the human soul, and passing a skeptical judgment, according to the laws of material nature, on that which can be understood only by an appeal to the inward consciousness, they soon made war on the eternal truths, which alone place man in harmony with himself, and allow him to enjoy his intrinsic dignity. With the words humanity and virtue continually upon their lips, they labored

for a long time to destroy every thing which makes humanity and virtue valuable; they studied to reduce man to the rank of an intelligent brute, by covering with doubt, and even with ridicule, all the ideas which tend to elevate him in his own eyes. Thus, in a short time, they prostrated the four great ideas, without which there is neither religion, nor dignity, nor true civilization, nor lasting improvement, nor solid happiness for the human race; the ideas of God, immortality, liberty, virtue. When these writers, surrounded with the ruins which they had made, began to perceive the need of erecting some positive system, led away by the habits of thought and feeling, which made them insensible to the divine character of Christianity, they soon substituted the idea of Nature for that of God, physical organization for the soul, the connexion of material causes and effects for liberty, and the suggestions of personal interest for virtue. Thus man was degraded and morality destroyed.

The pernicious influence of the writers of the eighteenth century was not confined to the higher classes of society. It spread among the people at large. These authors had an eye to popular effect in their works, and they succeeded in obtaining it. They employed the sallies of wit, and sometimes the most indecent raillery, instead of the profound discussions of reason, and thus acquired an immense power over the numerous class of readers who are repelled by argument and amused with pleasantry. Small publications were prepared expressly for the people, who, weary with ignorance and fanaticism, received them with avidity. At the close of the century, the great body of the people had become infidel. The ideas of virtue and immortality were regarded by them only with contempt and pity. But this state of things could not last. Man cannot be for ever deprived of the most essential attributes of his moral nature. Do what he will, he cannot lose the consciousness of himself. He will be called back to it, at last, by some great catastrophe, and, sooner or later, he will find there, written in bright and indelible characters, the words, God, immortality, liberty, virtue, and consequently the word religion. Scarcely had men arrived at the complete destitution of all faith, to which the eighteenth century had led them, when they began to feel that this was not their place. After the storms of the revolution had passed away, and men had

leisure to reflect on their own nature, and listen to the testimony of conscience, a solemn voice declared to them that organization and matter were not the whole man, and that they had something to care for, besides their own interests and pleasures. The word religion found an echo in many hearts. They began to speak of it, and of every thing connected with it, with more decency and respect. It was now considered bad taste to attack it, as in the preceding age, it was bad taste to defend it. This tendency to religious sentiments was interrupted by the strife of arms and the political agitations which followed. But as soon as peaceful pursuits and domestic life were restored, the want of religion was again manifested. The soul perceived its native grandeur and exalted destiny. On every side, it was declared, and on every side, — says M. Vincent, writing less than two years since, — it is declared, we must have a religion. The eighteenth century has fulfilled its task and passed away. Its sensual and epicurean philosophy is rejected by the public mind.

This increased interest in religion, after the universal prevalence of infidelity, appears to have been felt, in some degree, by all classes of the French community, but especially among the intelligent and liberal members of the Protestant church. We will continue to follow M. Vincent in his description of the character, which it has assumed.

The want of religion, as he maintains, which is every where manifested, is not the want of the forms, nor of the essential characteristics, to which time has already done justice. They have passed away, never to return. There is no desire to go back to the dark ages. There is no wish to revive their spirit. There is no want of the religion of that period. The burdensome ceremonies, the fantastic observances, the senseless practices which were then imposed, every where inspire the same disgust. The sacerdotal power is weakened and suspected. The authority of the priest is gone. The minister of religion is esteemed only for the influence on the mind and heart, which he exerts by the force of his example, of persuasion, and of truth. The minister is no longer clothed with priestly power. He is one of the flock whom he addresses. He is loved and venerated for his talents and virtues. But he is not a priest. That office is abolished, or if it remains, it is a ruin in the

midst of a populous city. It is inadequate to meet the religious spirit of the times. Of this, every one is thoroughly convinced.

The discussions of the eighteenth century have left another very important result, and one which is well established in the minds of the people. They have learned that the essence of religion does not consist in the historical certainty of all the details contained in the sacred volume. It must be confessed, that the want of religion now felt in the hearts of men is united with a great indifference for many things, to which former ages have attached peculiar importance, both in the sacred writings and in established religious systems. The public opinion is equally opposed to the cold and lifeless spirit of the infidel philosophy, and to the dogmatism and formality of the old religious sects. But if men are decided as to what they will reject, they are not so clear as to what they will receive. If they are very certain that the old edifice should be demolished and not rebuilt, they are far from being sure, respecting what should be erected in its place. This has given rise to a secret inquietude, an embarrassing hesitation between the forms which they feel compelled to reject, and the profound want, which they know not how to satisfy. The present is one of the great epochs in which a strong agitation pervades the general mind, — in which the necessity of a new path is felt, and its direction dimly anticipated, but not clearly perceived.

There are some points, however, which it is plain any new form of religion must embrace, in order to meet the state of public feeling in France. M. Vincent's discussion of this topic is discriminating and clear, and forms one of the most valuable portions of his work. We regret that we can give our readers only a very summary account of the ideas which it contains.

It is evident in the first place, M. Vincent remarks, that the religion which shall satisfy the demands of the age, must respect the rights of human nature and aid its further progress. There is a deep feeling, at the present day, among men, that they have a right as men to the greatest developement and to the free employment of all their faculties, physical, intellectual, and moral, in order to ameliorate their own personal condition and that of society in general. They accordingly demand of religion to respect the sacred liberty and eternal rights, of which the mainte-

nance and defence is the most important object of civil government. Every religion, which tends to restrain these rights of human nature, to interfere with the progress to which man is destined, or to deprive him of the perfect liberty of thought, of which he has already enjoyed such happy fruits, is not the religion that is now wanted. Men wish for free inquiry, not for authority. They wish to choose their own belief, not to receive it from prescription. This is the universal want; a want which pervades every sect, which extends even to the Catholics as well as to the Protestants. All the world is interested in this. All the world can and ought to take advantage of it. No one can change it. None can resist it, without great evil to their cause. We anticipate, then, a religion which shall advance in company with civilization, without being jealous of it; with science, without alarm at its success; with industry, without being disturbed at the happiness and security of the people, whom it enriches; with the institutions of society, without interfering with their improvement and perfection. We anticipate a religion, above all, which shall be the friend of human nature, which shall rejoice in every thing that elevates and ennobles it, which shall freely renounce every form and every influence that can restrain the exercise of the primitive and essential faculties of the soul, without which man has neither greatness, nor dignity, nor intellectual power, nor moral worth.

But the religion, which men need, cannot produce a beneficial effect if it is composed merely of negations. It must penetrate the whole man. It must act with energy upon the soul. It must carry it forward in the career of intellectual and moral perfection, without which man cannot fulfil his destiny. And to do this, it must appeal to his understanding, while its deep roots are in his heart; it must address his conscience, while it has a support in his imagination.

Still further, if we can name any universal feature in the confused ideas, which are formed on the religion demanded by the age, it is the wish for one essentially moral. Man cannot be separated from his conscience. He feels that in this august sanctuary he must find his true dignity. He is disgusted with all the degrading theories, which have diverted his attention from that sacred and incorruptible guide. He begins to recognise in that inward voice, the most exalted privilege of his nature, the most holy charac-

teristic of his relation to the Supreme Governor of the universe, the voice of God himself. He feels that every principle of action, independent of that, changes his true nature, robs him of his dignity, and invariably ends by making him incapable of self-devotion, and prepared for the most horrible excesses. He wishes, then, above all, for a religion which has its foundation in the conscience, and which builds upon it a genuine and profound morality. He rejects, by a generous instinct, which, perhaps, he cannot explain, but of which experience has taught him the value, all the opinions and systems, all the practices and theories, which tend to deceive him with regard to the true character of things, and the real merit of human actions. He understands that nothing should interpose between his conscience and himself.

An indispensable feature in the morality which the present religious wants of men demand, is the charity which at this day seems more and more to take possession of all hearts. It is not now sufficient for religion to recommend the principles of justice and probity, and make men merely honest. Human interests are often adequate to that end. We want religion to speak to the heart and to fill it with love. We want it to combat a selfish interest with the interests of human nature, to elevate man in the eyes of man, to point out to him his race as a worthy object of his cares and labors, a worthy recompense for his efforts and sacrifices, and a worthy subject of his devotion and love. We want it to restore man to the station which he feels belongs to him, when he is not borne away by the pleasures and interests of life,—that of a member of a vast moral society, destined to advance towards happiness by moral excellence and love, all the members of which bear in each other's sight an infinite value, since they have the same capacities, the same destiny, and the same rights. No religion can satisfy the heart of man, such as it is in itself, and such as it is manifested at the present day, unless it places in the highest rank, a profound love for the members of this moral society, and of God, who is its head.

The religion which the heart calls for, must be moreover essentially spiritual, that is, it must be established on the principles of a moral government, of an intelligent and moral Being, who is the foundation of it, and of a state of retribution, proceeding from the rights and wants of morality. A

system, deficient in any of these features, would not be a religion; it would leave man at the mercy of external circumstances; it would alienate him from his true destiny; it would deceive him on his true merit, and would be accompanied with fearful dangers. It is certain that if man needs a religion like that described, it must be drawn from the depths of his own soul. To speak with authority to the conscience, religion must be founded upon the conscience itself. To act with power upon the heart, it must come from the heart. To make man capable of self-devotion and love, it must show him self-devotion and love, in the hidden recesses of his nature. To rescue him from the materialism, which the contemplation of the physical world naturally inspires, it must lead him within the retirement of his own soul, and point out to him, in that sanctuary, a moral order and lofty principles, which physical laws cannot explain, and over which they have no power. The spiritual life and hope are in the inward sentiments of the heart, in the consciousness of duty and moral power. They are evaporated and dissipated, with all religious feelings, as soon as they are made the subjects of a discussion founded on the analogies of external nature, according to the common rules of logic. Such an explanation would be nothing else than the general irreligion of the last century.

We have thus given a slight outline of the views maintained by M. Vincent, respecting the character of the religion demanded by the wants of the age, and the state of public feeling in France. He then inquires, Where shall such a religion be found? How shall we answer such a complicated question? One word, says he, will suffice; — CHRIST. Of all known religions, Christianity is the only one, which perfectly fulfils the condition, which has been laid down as the foundation of all others, and as the only source of a living and profound religion; it is taken from the inmost sentiments of man. It is a revelation, but a revelation of the human soul. Its universal and avowed object is to withdraw man from outward hindrances and errors, to lead him to look within and to contemplate the principle of every excellence and every virtue, which he bears in the depths of his heart.

We are not to suppose that the ideas presented by M. Vin-

cent, respecting the religious wants of France, are universally received. Indeed many of them are probably stated with precision for the first time, to the readers of his work. It remains for them to be examined and discussed by his Protestant brethren, who share in his enlightened zeal to promote the interests of pure religion in France. We have no doubt they will commend themselves to the good sense and Christian feeling of the nation, although there are many obstacles to their immediate prevalence. Among other difficulties, they will have to contend with the low state of theological science. M. Vincent devotes one of his best chapters to the consideration of this subject. He holds an improved theology to be essential to the progress of an improved religion. Not that theology and religion, in his view, are the same. On the contrary, we have never seen a better illustration of the essential difference between them, than that given by our author.

Theology, according to him, is a science which has principles founded in nature, and facts upon which it depends. It is addressed to the understanding. It should have no object but absolute truth. But religion is altogether another thing. It is the communion of the soul with the Creator. It has less concern with the understanding than with the feelings and affections. It seizes in the resources of theology every thing which is simple, every thing which is living, every thing which touches and elevates the heart. In the view of religion, God is not the necessary Being demonstrated by philosophy, with an array of metaphysical jargon which no one can understand,—but the Father, the Benefactor, the Judge. In the view of religion, Jesus Christ is not the abstract being, upon whom there have been such violent disputes in almost every age of the church,—but the visible image of God, who has brought down to the comprehension of men, the excellence and goodness which we seek in heaven, the Saviour, the Friend, who died on the cross for us. In the view of religion, the future state is not the immense field for controversy, where learned men have so often contended in the dark,—but the mansion of our Father's house, which Jesus has gone to prepare for us, the place where we shall be with him and receive according to our works. Theology, being thus distinct from religion, no fears should be apprehended from its progress. It may undergo great

changes, without affecting the essentials of religion. It may be improved and perfected without implying that the foundation of religion in the heart is not always the same. The advancement of theology is then desirable. But in this respect, since the return to religious sentiments in France, the Protestant church presents a remarkable spectacle.*

M. Vincent describes three classes of religious men, from whose respective influence, he remarks, the progress of sound theology may, with some certainty, be predicted. These classes, as our readers will perceive, are not without counterparts in our own country.

The first class, according to M. Vincent, is composed of the individuals who remain attached to the system adopted by the French Protestant church, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They constitute a class which may be called the old school. They have read the ancient theologians, but they know nothing of the immense labors with which theology has been enriched in modern times. Sacred criticism is a science which they suspect. They are not unwilling that it should exist, but on condition of doing nothing, discovering nothing, establishing nothing, which had not been done before. They see in it every where perilous abysses. If you speak to them of various readings in the sacred text, they regard you with terror. 'Sir,' they reply, 'what uncertainty you throw over the Bible.' They are even angry with you, as if it were you who placed the various readings in the manuscripts. If you speak to them of historical and impartial researches on the different books

* The distinction between theology and religion, which M. Vincent here maintains, will remind many of our readers of the views presented in a Discourse, entitled 'Theology, and not Religion, the Source of Division in the Christian Church,' by the Rev. Dr. Lowell, of this city. We think the coincidence remarkable. The distinction has been very generally overlooked. But in the work before us and in the Discourse to which we refer, written nearly at the same time in different countries, it is clearly stated and earnestly defended. Both writers agree in not condemning theological controversy, as such; they only protest against confounding it with the religion of the heart. We have no doubt of the correctness of their views in this respect. We are convinced that their general prevalence would be highly favorable to the progress of an improved theology, which is a favorite object with M. Vincent, as well as to the increase of vital and practical religion, which is equally a favorite object with him and the author of the Discourse.

of the Bible, they answer, 'What! would you make a human book of it?' In a word, they are as much terrified at facts, as if they were so many sophisms. They think that all the discoveries of modern theology are mere inventions. This class is small, but strongly prejudiced. They who compose it have arrived at that age of life, when opinions are not altered. It is the age of bronze. We ought not to attempt to change them. Let them pass away.

The second class is composed of a great number of pastors, who have reflected sufficiently on Protestantism, and on its present condition in Europe, to perceive that liberty of thought is its very essence, and who make this liberty a reality and not a name. They are aware that the natural consequence of such liberty must be a great difference of opinion on a certain number of points. But as this liberty is unspeakably dear to them; as they hold to it firmly for themselves, and as they have observed, with the clearest evidence, in the whole history of the Christian religion, and of the human race, that the free exercise of this liberty has always conducted man to the highest degree of civilization, of moral perfection, and of true piety; as they have observed, also, with no less evidence, that the restraint or suppression of this liberty has always introduced barbarism, moral degradation, impiety or fanaticism, and misery, they would much rather endure these differences of opinion, than renounce a system, which they believe founded on Christianity, and connected with the highest destinies of the human race. They are then essentially tolerant, not only towards the members of other churches, as some men understand toleration, but towards those of the church of which they are a part.

Among these, a spirit of research and a taste for good learning are generally cultivated. The public are indebted to them for the useful labors which place at their disposal new ideas and new means of instruction. They seek for the profitable employment of the acquisitions which they have already made, and endeavour to turn them to the moral and religious improvement of the flocks with which they are entrusted. They engage in this labor with a zeal, an activity, a warmth of heart, until lately very rare in France. It is on this class, in our author's opinion, that the hopes and wishes of the French Protestant church must rest.

Besides these two classes, which compose the great majority of the French Protestant clergy, there is a small class of those, who, properly or improperly, are called Methodists, because the first of them who appeared in France, were pupils or agents of the English Methodist sects. At first sight, one might be disposed to identify them with the old school before described. They have the same attachment to the great principles of orthodoxy, the same love of ancient institutions, the same dread of innovation. But as soon as we penetrate a little further, we perceive that the two classes have no real resemblance. Under nearly the same expressions, there is another tendency, another spirit, we might almost say, another religion. Their mode of proceeding in theology is very simple. They assume as a principle the immediate and plenary inspiration of the Bible. In their opinion it is the Word of God, in the most literal sense. Then they group detached passages of it under certain heads. They form centos of these, in which every thing appears consistent, full of the same spirit. But since their historical observations are generally wanting in depth, when applied to this labor, the spirit is more frequently that of their own sect than of the Bible. Still, they hold to the results which they obtain, with ardor, often with obstinacy. They connect them directly with the work of salvation. They make them essential to its attainment. They are thus insensibly led to the Catholic maxim, that there is no salvation out of the church. Whatever activity the individuals animated by this spirit may display in their religious pursuits, it is certain that we cannot expect from them any aid to the progress of a sound and liberal theology. The example of the English sects, whose spirit they have imbibed, gives us the character of the labors to which they are devoted, and the results which they will probably produce.

We can accompany our author no further in his fine reasonings on the perfection of theology, but must hasten to give our readers some account of his ideas respecting the means of diffusing correct religious sentiments and increasing the practical influence of Christianity in the present state of opinion in France. The preaching of mere morality he holds to be altogether inadequate to that purpose. The great truths of a spiritual religion must be clearly and distinctly

addressed to man's spiritual nature. It is not sufficient to demonstrate these truths to his understanding; they must be applied directly to his heart. They must reveal man to himself. They must make him feel the dignity of his nature, the value of his hopes, the grandeur of his destiny. The very thing which gives Christianity its power over the soul, which makes it effectual in the work of salvation, is, that it corresponds so perfectly with the inward testimony of conscience. It is at once the expression of its native purity, the manifestation of its most sublime promises, and the remedy for its weaknesses and imperfections. It is the revelation of that moral world, of which we find the first elements in the depths of our conscience, when we are willing to seek them there. For this reason it acts with a mighty power upon our souls, excites in us a living faith that knows no doubt, and rules over our whole life. Accordingly they who wish to promote the influence of Christianity should never lose sight of this essential characteristic.

After expressing, at considerable length, his conviction of the importance of a spiritual religion, in addition to the details of morality, M. Vincent presents several interesting views on the three great religious systems, which, in his opinion, comprise all that are worthy of notice, founded on the teachings of Christ and his apostles, or on philosophical ideas inherent in the human mind. These are Calvinism, Arminianism, and Rationalism. They are characterized respectively, by their placing the central point of religion in God, or in man, or in the relations between God and man. The choice among them, he maintains, is by no means indifferent, whether regarded in relation to their philosophical and critical truth, or their practical application to the mass of society, as popular religious systems. We will give our readers a brief abstract of his sentiments respecting these systems.

Calvinism, which places every thing in God, and annihilates man, is a system of doctrines, according to our author, to which man is led by the developement of his reason, but not by his feelings, or the sentiment of faith. He arrives at predestination by the way of abstract reasoning, and the deduction of consequences. He applies the spirit of logic to the simple principles of nature, feeling, and conscience. He pushes the consequences he thus obtains to their utmost limits, for this is the tendency of the faculty which he uses, and

in this way creates a world which neither feeling, nor conscience, nor nature acknowledges. The result is a philosophic system, supported by rigorous argumentation, but insufficient as a religion, since it offends the inward consciousness, destroys the sentiment of human dignity, annihilates the value of morality, and allows nothing but an arbitrary will,—all which is at war with every thing that man must feel and believe, in order to be truly religious. This system calls in question human liberty. It introduces into the moral world the same necessity which reigns in the physical world. It destroys at one blow the most solid foundation of all religion. For the consciousness of moral liberty, in the midst of the necessity which commands material nature, is the only fact, yet sufficient and unanswerable in itself, which reveals to us a higher nature, a more sacred order, and, in a word, an immortal future and a God. This system is then at war with the most profound and holy ideas of man,—the ideas, without which, in reality, there is no religion. Accordingly, many have supposed they believed in this system, when, in fact, they did not, because, in spite of themselves, their souls experienced an invincible repugnance to its desolating doctrines. Nevertheless, it responds to the want of the absolute which is inherent in the human soul, it excites the imagination, it penetrates the heart with deep terror, and when it takes possession of a man, it does not possess him half-way. It finds a powerful aid, in the feeling of the vast distance, between the moral law, which is absolute, and the actual life, which is imperfect,—to depreciate and annihilate man. But the authority which it exercises, irresistible as it sometimes is, is not always beneficent. Although some brilliant examples to the contrary may be mentioned, it weakens the feelings of humanity in the soul. This is its most obvious danger. We may justly dread it. It injures the sentiment of respect for man, so much as to produce cruelty, as soon as it is thought that the glory of God is compromised.

Whatever may be the logical consistency of this system, it cannot then accomplish its purpose, because it is not founded on the genuine principles of religion, and because its tendency is deplorable. It may, indeed, with a little management, be made to find access to many minds. But this would be a real misfortune. For it can never gain a general triumph, and this partial success would introduce a division, perhaps incurable.

The next religious system, described by our author, as applicable to the popular wants of France, is Arminianism, the central principle of which is redemption. As Calvinism takes predestination for the basis of its theory concerning man and religion, Arminianism, as it is understood by M. Vincent, is built upon the difference between the *idéal* of human nature, and the actual condition of man on earth. This difference, recognised in all ages, is announced in the sacred volume as one of its most important doctrines. It regards man in a fallen and degraded state, which prevents the accomplishment of the divine plans for his happiness. The consciousness of each individual confirms this truth, which history always takes for granted, and which is contained in the traditions, the symbols, and the mythology of every nation. The unchangeable justice of God, to which we are led, both by reason and conscience, makes it inevitable that man should suffer a loss of happiness in proportion to the extent of his corruption. At this point, appears one of the great doctrines of Christianity, considered as a miraculous and supernatural revelation. Man could do nothing of himself, to avoid the punishment which he deserved, and the demands of moral order, not only in the earth, but through the universe, require that this punishment should be inflicted. Jesus Christ is sent to resolve the problem of human salvation under these conditions, and his voluntary death is the means of it. Man enjoys the benefit of this dispensation by faith, that is, by the feeling of personal unworthiness, and by his acceptance of this dispensation as the only way of salvation. Thus restored to hope, and feeling more deeply than ever the horror of sin, he is regenerated, and becomes capable of tasting the happiness which God has prepared for him.

Here, then, is a religion, says M. Vincent, which man can accept, a religion which acts strongly upon his affections, which recalls him to the perception of his exalted destiny, and animates him while still on earth with the life of Heaven. But this system, as it is often preached, fails of its end. The reason is, that it is burdened with additions which do not belong to it, and of which this is sometimes the least inconvenience. The mind is thus lost in a multitude of interminable discussions. The heart, without which religion is nothing but a vain sound, takes no interest in such abstrusi-

ties, and the effect of preaching is destroyed. For this system to be a true religion, it must be presented with great simplicity. It must be addressed to the secret consciousness of man. On the one hand, it must place before his eyes the sublimity and sanctity of his moral nature, in the ideal type, which God has stamped upon his heart; and on the other, it must insist on his actual degradation, and the condition to which it leads him. This point obtained, much undoubtedly is done. Jesus has only to appear, with his divine grace; he will be received as a Saviour. The heart once melted in penitence, will experience religious feelings; and the doctrine of redemption, far from meeting with disgust and contempt, will be welcomed with ardent desires. But it must not be forgotten, that every thing consists in taking the right view of this system, and urging the essential points which constitute it,—and to succeed in this, one must have the courage to abstain from preaching the dogmas which are in fact foreign to the system, and the only effect of which is to dissipate the attention in useless subtleties.

Our readers will perceive that the doctrine of redemption, as stated by M. Vincent, is reduced to the simplicity of the New Testament. As he explains it, it is altogether a different thing from the obscure and artificial doctrine which has held a prominent rank in most human creeds. We thus have his testimony added to that of many of the most enlightened Christians, and able divines, both in our own and in other countries, that the idea of redemption which affects the heart and meets the moral wants of man, with the greatest power, is very unlike the complicated systems on the subject, which have often been proposed as essential to salvation.

The other religious system, which our author considers, is Rationalism. Let no one, says he, be frightened by the word. We ought, perhaps, to repeat his caution, with some emphasis. At any rate, let us guard against misapprehension. Let not our readers be deceived by the name. Let it be understood, that the system, which he calls Rationalism, is essentially distinct from that designated by the term Rational Christianity in England and in our own country. The former, it ought to be well known, expresses the views maintained by a class of theologians, principally in Germany, who regard the Christian religion as a developement of many important

truths, and a useful aid in the moral advancement of the human race, but not as a miraculous revelation from God. This system has had considerable prevalence among learned men in different parts of the continent of Europe, though, at present, it is generally understood to be on the decline. However that may be, it has never met with a friendly reception, either in England or in this country. We cannot call to mind an eminent man among us who has written in its defence. We know that our most liberal divines have strenuously maintained the contrary views. Many of their works present express and able arguments in favor of the very point, on the rejection of which the German Rationalism is founded, namely, the supernatural origin of the Christian religion. It is, then, a gross inaccuracy to confound this system, as has sometimes been done by responsible writers, with the system that bears with us the similar name of Rational Christianity. They resemble each other in name, and that is all, since the one admits and the other denies the great question at issue.

To return to M. Vincent, whose ideas on this subject are original and striking. Rationalism, he remarks, appears at first as a mere negation. It makes no account of the miraculous portions of the Christian history, and regards the introduction of that religion into the world, as an extraordinary act of Providence, but accomplished by natural and ordinary means. It rejects any thing claiming to be a supernatural revelation, and admits no ideas, as matters of faith, but such as result from the proper exercise of the human reason. Every thing else it resolves into temporary opinions, which have only an historical interest for us, or into symbols with which the spirit of antiquity clothed the great ideas which form the essence of religion. As it began with the work of demolition, Rationalism must have remained, for a long time, a merely negative system. But so long it could not pretend to constitute a religion. A religion cannot be established on negations. It must maintain positive truths. By negations, the mind, perhaps, is delivered from many errors and false motives by which it has been deluded. But it remains barren. It waits for something better. It is not in this state that the soul can glow with ardor and accomplish great things. Religion ought to reign over man, to command his affections, to subdue his evil passions, to give him

the spirit of self-sacrifice, to elevate him above the world, and, in the very bosom of the cares and tumults of life, to make him a pure and heavenly-minded being. But to exercise this dominion, religion must have a power, a strong hold over the soul, which negations cannot give. It is not by what man denies, but by what he believes, that he is great and mighty. So long as he takes pride in saying, 'I do not believe in this,' 'I do not believe in that,'—since he will always believe in himself,—we can expect from him only selfishness and coldness, never warmth of heart and disinterestedness. It is certain that the epochs in which points of faith have been diminished, are more generally marked by sterility of soul, than the epochs in which they have been increased. In order for Rationalism to become a religion, it was, then, necessary that it should be enabled to take possession of the soul, by presenting to it clear and positive truths, appropriate to its eternal faculties, and its acquired ideas,—sufficient, in a word, to fill and govern it. It is not surprising, that they who are limited to the work of pulling down, and never think of building up, cold themselves, should have been received with coldness. They had taken away the handle with which the world had hitherto been moved, but they had not placed another in its stead, and the world escaped from them. After having rested in negations, it was necessary, then, that Rationalism should begin to assert positive truths. After having pruned away many old opinions, whose influence was once powerful, it was obliged to find, in its own resources, new and positive points, of faith, capable of satisfying the mind, of warming the heart, and of governing the will of men, to whom it is addressed.

To express the doctrine, which Rationalism has made its central point, there is no term more appropriate than this,—Humanity. Human nature, taken it its whole extent, furnishes profound and quickening truths, capable of exerting a powerful influence on the life. It attains this importance, however, only when it is regarded in a spiritual point of view.

The human soul, its intellectual faculties, its innate love, its desire of order; morality, which is the result of an absolute intelligence applied to these first principles of the conscience and the heart; liberty, which is the birth-right of this sublime essence, and is sufficient to distinguish it from matter; the moral world, which our conscience reveals

to us, with as much clearness as the eye reveals the physical world; God and Immortality, the first conditions of the existence of such a world; man, destined to take part in it, as a free and moral being; all his faculties and all the tendencies of his nature, adapted to this destination, and the material world, confirming the indications of conscience by the unequivocal proofs which it contains of order, benevolence, and a moral providence; the infinite value which man thus acquires in the view of his own reason; the bonds, which unite him with his brethren, made more sacred and delightful because they are men like himself; virtue, becoming more precious and holy, because it makes man more than man, and strengthens the ties which connect him with the moral world and with his immortal destiny; — these are some of the great positive truths contained in the system of Rationalism. They are taken from the depths of human nature; they tend to ennoble the human soul. They regard the whole human race as one great family, of which each man should consider himself a member, in which he should devote his life to the greatest good of the whole, in which alone he can find his own true happiness. To destroy selfishness by unfolding the life of humanity, to take from the importance of this earthly life, which is but a feeble portion of human existence, by quickening the spiritual life, the life of the moral world taken in its whole extent; — this is the object of the system. Was it not also the object of our Saviour? Does not this spirit breathe through all his words? Rationalism does nothing but establish it on a philosophic foundation, and disengage it from the mysterious forms, with which it has been clothed.

Here, then, continues our author, are the principles of an efficient religious system, or rather of every religion that is grand, holy, and pure. These ideas once admitted cannot fail of exerting a great influence on the soul, for they are the expression of its most profound and secret feelings. They do not, however, make up the whole of Christianity, any more than other systems, without this, do justice to the whole nature of man.

It is the opinion of M. Vincent, that in the union of this system with the one before described, the foundation must be laid of a religion at once rational and evangelical, philosophic and popular. It is by instructions directed in this

manner, that we can act on the mass of society, revive an interest in religion, restore to the human soul its dignity, establish virtue on a more solid and purer foundation, than some philosophers and Christians have dared to give it, and render more invincible by the force of feeling and of love, the natural horror of vice and sin.

The union between the Rational system, which has human nature for its central point, and the Supra-natural system, which has redemption for its basis, is not so difficult as at first sight may be imagined. Indeed, this is in the natural course of things. Not only will it be attempted, but it must needs be accomplished. It is a connected chain of ideas, in which philosophy leads us to the threshold of Christianity, and Christianity to our final destination. Humanity, love, the sanctity of the moral law, the unseen moral world, the destiny of man to virtue and happiness, the imperfection of man, and sin;— these are philosophical truths. The means of restoring this fallen being are made known by Christianity, after having confirmed all the former truths with its indisputable authority. Let the preachers of the Gospel give their whole hearts to the exposition of these ideas, and the hearts of men will answer to the appeal. They will return to the consciousness of their own dignity; and a merely material and sensual life will give place to a superior life, the life of moral order, of hope, and of humanity.

We have now laid before our readers some of the most important ideas advanced by M. Vincent respecting the state and prospects of religion in his own country. To our minds the subject is full of interest. We think no one can fail of deriving from it materials for useful reflection. We know not, indeed, to what extent the revival of a religious spirit in France has been carried. We are not blind to the many obstacles with which it must needs contend. We are aware that after all the changes which have taken place, there is much open or secret infidelity in different classes of society, on the one hand; and on the other, a tendency to fantastic and extravagant religious notions, which have had considerable success in the present unsettled state of public opinion. It is not all the Protestant ministers who possess the intelligence and liberality of M. Vincent, nor yet the primitive zeal and cordial charity of the apostolic Oberlin. But a noble spirit

is at work among them. The influence of such men as the present writer and others of a similar stamp, must be widely felt. They have received the great quickening truths of Christianity with their whole souls, and, raised above the low bigotry and superstition of former ages, have devoted the energies of the heart and the head to the promotion of a pure, spiritual, and rational religion among their countrymen. Who does not bid them 'God speed' in their holy enterprise? They do not engage in it alone. Many eyes are upon them. Many hearts, though divided by the broad ocean, beat in sympathy with theirs. Many prayers go up to the common Father that his most precious blessings may rest upon them.

We regard the experiment, which has been made in France, for forty years past, as settling the question with respect to the importance of religion. Every effort was made to eradicate it from the hearts of men. No means were spared to level the Church of Christ to the earth, and grind it to powder. Philosophy, history, poetry, eloquence, the current literature of the day and the elaborate volumes of the *Encyclopédie*, wit and argument, subtlety and strength, all the resources of the human mind were arrayed in hostility to religion. Many were, undoubtedly, sincere in their opposition to it. They knew it only as it had been masked, and their natures rose against it. No wonder. They deemed it a pest to society. But so much the worse for religion. It was betrayed into mortal peril, by the company it had kept. What chance could it have, yoked with a system of superstition which the heart loathed; assailed by powerful minds, indignant at execrable abuses; burdened with the mummeries of dark ages in an age of light? But so it was. Yet religion survived. Had it been a delusion, a mockery, a phantom, it must have quailed before the blows, dealt by giant arms. Had not a divine spirit been in it, it must have followed its ancient companion to the grave. If ever the man lived who could root out religion from the world, it was Voltaire. He did what he could. In his own sphere he partially succeeded. For a time his triumph seemed inevitable. He was popular, powerful, the idol of his age. He spread the cry against religion, — 'Away with it! away with it!' and the people banished it from the land. Half a century has not elapsed, and the people begin to feel that they have been deceived.

The heart of man, true to itself, returns to its deep yearnings after spiritual blessedness. It cries out for the living God. And so it always will be. Religion belongs to the human soul. It is as much its birthright as reason, or conscience, or natural affection. No power which does not destroy the very elements of our being can pluck it thence. Man may be deprived of it by tempory influences; he may be blinded to its celestial beauty; he may mistake its character, and when it comes to him with the richest blessings, may reject it as a deadly foe. But this cannot always be. He will return at last to himself, and then, like the prodigal of old, the vital cravings of his heart will lead him back to his Father's house.

The example of France convinces us, moreover, of the desperate folly of insisting on any points of faith, except the clear and essential principles of Christianity. What was it that men attacked in their furious zeal against religion? The abuses of Christianity, the mysteries, the contradictions, the palpable absurdities, which had been connected with it, and, through these, Christianity itself. What is it to which they are now returning after the deathlike sleep of infidelity? Not the strange dogmas of the old theologians, but the living truths which shine forth, with light and beauty, from every word of our Saviour's instructions. These must constitute the religion of the coming age, or it will have no religion at all. This is true of France, and of the Christian, the civilized world. The springs of the old machine are worn out. They cannot be restored. The idea of repairing them is a chimera. Let us not waste our strength in miserable efforts to do so. Let the energy of Christian love and the ardor of Christian faith be devoted to the support of those eternal truths, which reveal man to himself and closely link him with his brethren, to which the Son of God came into the world to bear witness, and which give every one who receives them the witness in his own heart; — then we may look, if not for a fancied millenium, for many years of the reign of peace, righteousness, wisdom, and charity, even the full coming of the kingdom of God on earth.

ART. II. — *Letters to the Rev. Joel Hawes, D. D., in Review of his 'Tribute to the Memory of the Pilgrims.'* By SAMUEL J. MAY, Pastor of the First Church in Brooklyn, Connecticut. Hartford: Printed by Philemon Canfield. 1831. 8vo. pp. 72.

FOR interesting and instructive matter, and unexceptionable manner, we can safely recommend this pamphlet as one of the best which has appeared in the Unitarian controversy.

Although Dr. Hawes's 'Tribute to the Memory of the Pilgrims' has attracted so little attention in our part of the world that we should not probably have noticed it, yet as the production of a man who stands high in his own denomination and city, and one therefore which has doubtless been much read in his own denomination and city, it was deserving of an answer, direct and on the spot, which might be circulated just where it would be likely to produce the most effect. We are glad that it has been answered, or rather that those parts of it which required an answer from Unitarians have been answered so well. We hope that all those who read the 'Tribute' will also read these 'Letters,' and then they may read the 'Tribute' as much as they please; not that we look to see them converted by the 'Letters,' but that we think they must be enlightened and rendered more charitable by them.

The present is a fair instance of the advantages of religious controversy. Here is a Connecticut clergyman, of great repute in his own state, but with rather more zeal than knowledge, and not quite so much liberality as a Christian ought to have, who, being but superficially acquainted with Unitarians or their opinions, but thoroughly imbued with extravagant prejudices against them, has been proclaiming his misapprehensions and maledictions in the most excited manner from the pulpit, and then spreading them still further by means of the press. Those who look up to Dr. Hawes as a teacher, both in and out of his parish, will be influenced by his sentiments, infected by his fears, and moved by his appeals; and their horror of Unitarians will be so confirmed and heightened, that they will not only refuse to regard them as fellow Christians, but will hardly consider them as neighbours and fellow men. What is to be done? We say

decidedly that these people should be disabused, as far as it is possible for reason and facts to disabuse them, and that Dr. Hawes ought to be answered. He has been answered, and just in such a manner as we should have desired. He has been answered by one of the most peacefully disposed of men, with temperateness, discretion, candor, and charity, and yet with no deficiency of force and spirit. Mr. May's Letters will certainly be read by some of those who had given their faith to Dr. Hawes, and therefore must do some good. And what possible harm they can do to any one, we cannot conceive. They will doubtless disturb Dr. Hawes in his opinion of his own infallibleness, but this can do him no injury, and may be of great eventual service to him, and those who hear him.

Mr. May's Letters are five in number, with the following titles. 'I. On Fundamental Articles of Faith. II. On the Primitive Churches. III. Doctrines of the Reformation. IV. The Pilgrims. V. On certain Charges and Insinuations against Unitarians.'

From the First Letter we will quote a passage, in which is ably portrayed and exposed a kind of liberality which has undoubtedly been practised of late, to a considerable degree, by the Orthodox, and of the praise of which we have no intention of depriving them. We mean their liberality toward those who mainly agree with them.

'You begin, Sir, with an avowal of much liberality of feeling towards your fellow Christians, and reiterate the same in other parts of your Lectures. But you are always very careful to restrict yourself, in this indulgence, to those, who differ from you only in respect of forms and ceremonies, and "things not essential." As to others, who see cause to dissent from doctrines, which you consider fundamental — they are nowhere within the limits of your condescension. But pray, Sir, what *authority* have you for determining, that a certain system of faith, or that particular doctrines embrace the fundamentals, and no more than the fundamentals, of the Gospel? I know this authority has always been arrogated by the leaders of sects, but it always has been, and always will be, high presumption, in any man or body of men. It is peculiarly offensive in this age of the world, and in our country. All Protestants agree to condemn the Church of Rome, for doing this; and yet, Sir, (if the voices of antiquity and of the majority are to be regarded in matters of faith) the Pope has a stronger claim to the right of prescription, than the head of any other church. "If

I were a Roman Catholic," to use the words of Professor Stuart, "I could then take the exposition, which an infallible church or Pope has given, of any and every part of Scripture. I should never need any other argument in favor of my interpretation, excepting evidence that an infallible expositor had decided in favor of it. But being a Protestant, and having as yet never been able to find an infallible expositor since the days of inspiration have passed away, I value the privilege of examining opinions, advanced upon the meaning of the Scriptures, more than all the treasures of earth." * Of this inestimable privilege, you, Sir, and those who act with you, would deprive me and other Unitarians, by inflicting all the suffering upon us, it is in your power to inflict, under our government, at the present day. You deny us the Christian name, and Christian fellowship. You proclaim us aliens from Christ — enemies of God. You speak of us in terms of detestation, and utter abhorrence. You call our opinions, or what you suppose to be our opinions, "that delusive system which is sweeping so fast into those regions of error, where the spirit of God never comes, *and the voice of redeeming mercy is never heard!*" What more can you do, what more can you say, to render us odious, hateful — objects of suspicion, avoidance, horror? If your measures respecting us should succeed, what further inflictions would be needed to make our lives burthensome to us? And all this you, and others of your denomination, have done, and are doing, for what? Because we do not believe all, that you think to be fundamental doctrines of the Gospel. If we complain of this as ill usage, and chance to call it persecution, the sneer goes round, as if we were using words that have no meaning. And if we should add, that it evinces in you an unchristian spirit, then is the charge of unkindness retorted.' — pp. 4, 5.

A page or two farther on, Mr. May expresses a hope that 'the time is coming when Protestants will act consistently with their protestations.' To show what would be consistent, is the purpose of the remainder of his First Letter; and he proves that whoever seriously and honestly professes to believe in Jesus as the Christ, and takes him as his master and teacher, is a disciple and a Christian, so far as belief can make him one, and is entitled to Christian communion and privileges. This cannot be disproved. When

* In 'The Register and Journal of the American Education Society,' 1828, p. 94.

a man consents to be taught by Christ, no other man nor any church has a right to tell him, authoritatively, what he shall learn, or refuse him fellowship if he does not learn what they do. There will be no peace, no charity, no unity in Christendom, till this great truth is acknowledged. We will introduce a few words on this point from our author.

'You will ask, no doubt, Must we not believe what is taught in the New Testament? Certainly. But what *is* taught in that book? Shall you tell me, or I tell you? Or shall we go together to the study of the precious volume, as brethren, and assist each other to understand it as well as we can? The very point in dispute between your denomination and that to which I belong, is, What *does* the New Testament teach? Now if you can tell us, *with unerring certainty*, what we shall find in it, we need not trouble ourselves to examine its pages. But you will not take upon you this responsibility. You bid us read it for ourselves! You have much to say about the inestimable privilege of doing so. If then we go to *that book* for instruction, we will believe what it teaches us — we cannot believe otherwise. And will you punish us for so doing? Punish us by fire, imprisonment, or the scourge, you cannot — and I do not believe you would do so if you could. But punish us in other ways you can do, have done, and seem still determined to do.' — p. 13.

The Second Letter commences with a paragraph, in which the design of the second, third, and fourth letters is thus briefly set forth.

'Rev. Sir, — If I have not wholly mistaken the main purpose of your Lectures, it is to make the public believe, what you undoubtedly think to be true, that the system of faith, and the discipline of our orthodox congregational churches, are substantially the same with those, for the enjoyment and perpetuation of which our pious forefathers forsook their pleasant homes, and all the comforts of the civilized world, and fled to this "then howling wilderness." Still more — that they are the same for the recovery of which, the noble Reformers of the sixteenth century dared to defy the power of the Papal See. And the same, even, that were maintained by the primitive Christians. These three pleas, in behalf of orthodoxy, so often urged at the present day, I intend to examine in this, and the two following letters. I shall consider the last first.' — p. 20.

That the doctrines and discipline of the congregational

churches of the present day are the same with those of the primitive churches, is an assumption which Mr. May then shows to be groundless. We must content ourselves with one extract from this part of his argument.

'Where do you find, either in the Acts of the Apostles, or their Epistles, that they allowed none to join the churches but holy persons? Or that they intended to conduct on this principle? I will not trouble you to dispose of the case of Ananias and Sapphira. But what will you make of those members of the Corinthian church, who turned the Lord's Supper into a riotous feast,* some of them drinking at it even to intoxication? And why did not the Apostle excommunicate, or suspend them, if the church there was formed on the principle you have stated? Once more, how can you explain certain reproofs and injunctions, that are given by the Apostles in several of their Epistles, if the churches to which they wrote were communities of holy persons? No, Sir. The first Christian churches were communities of persons called to be holy, and professing a desire to become so. All that was required of them in order to admission was to declare their faith in Jesus Christ. They were permitted to retain their standing unless their conduct was grossly immoral, or disorderly. So long as there was any reason to hope for their amendment, so long they were retained. Dr. Mosheim states that those persons were excommunicated, "who had been guilty of *enormous transgressions*, and to whom repeated exhortations to repentance and amendment had been administered in vain." He mentions no other.

'The following extract from the same learned author, will go far to disprove your assertions, and establish mine. (Hist. Vol. I. Pt. II. ch. iii. sect. 9.) "The lives and manners of the Christians of the first century are highly celebrated by most authors, and recommended to succeeding generations as unspotted models of piety and virtue. And if these encomiums be confined to the greatest part of those, who embraced Christianity *in the infancy of the church*, they are certainly distributed with justice. But many run into extremes upon this head, and estimating the lives and manners of all, by the illustrious examples of some eminent saints, or the sublime precepts and exhortations of certain pious doctors, fondly imagine, that every appearance of vice and disorder was banished from the first Christian societies. The greatest part of those au-

'* 1 Cor. chap. xi.'

thors, who have written concerning the innocence and sanctity of the primitive Christians, have fallen into this agreeable error. *And a gross error indeed it is, as the strongest testimonies too evidently prove.*" '—pp. 24, 25.

But the strength of this pamphlet lies particularly in the Third and Fourth Letters. The great parade which has been made about the doctrines of the glorious Reformation, and the faith of our Pilgrim forefathers, is treated as it deserves to be, and shrinks before the light of examination and history. It is wonderful and lamentable how people have been deceiving themselves and others on this most simple subject; making no distinction between the doctrinal opinions of the Reformers and Pilgrims, and the great doctrine and principle of the reformation and pilgrimage, which was *the right of private judgment;* and talking of the former in a style and temper diametrically opposed to the latter. One would think that the Reformers were popes, real, infallible popes, instead of the sturdy opposers of popes, from the way in which a certain class of theologians have been setting them up over the faith of the world. We revere the Reformers, and the Pilgrims too, for what they did, not for what they believed; for their resistance to spiritual tyranny, and their maintenance of spiritual freedom, and not for their doctrinal speculations. And what advantage would it be to us, that they had emancipated us from the power of popes and bishops, if we were to be pinned down under their own? What great privilege would be gained for us, by a transfer of spiritual authority from the Roman tiara to the Genevan cap? Why is all this noise about the opinions of the Reformers, as if they had settled every thing for all ages and all men? It is the height of folly, and it ought to be scouted as such, till sensible men shall be ashamed to give it utterance.

But who are the Reformers? What are their glorious doctrines? Did they agree among themselves? If they did not, which is the infallible one? Shall we bow to Luther, or Calvin, or Zuingle, or Socinus?—Socinus!—Yes, Socinus; for he was a Reformer as good as the best, and as learned as the most learned of them. But let us hear Mr. May on this point.

'Luther and Melancthon drew up their system of doctrines,

which was afterwards engrossed in the Augsburg Confession. Zuingle announced his peculiar opinions, some of which were so much unlike those of Luther, that a sharp controversy ensued between them. Then came Calvin, with his vast scheme of doctrines and discipline, raised indeed upon Zuingle's, which it in fact superseded, yet differing from his in several very important particulars. And, not to mention others — Socinus ventured to suggest the results of his profound researches in the sacred Scriptures. But these were so wide a departure from the faith of the others, that he incurred the peculiar displeasure of them all, especially of Calvin. This, however, vented itself rather upon the kindred opinions of Servetus, who was probably a man of more vehement temperament than Socinus; and propounded his opinions in a more confident tone. Now, as a good old lady asked Melancthon "what she must believe in this great confusion of creeds" — I also would ask you, Sir, which of these systems (if either) we are bound to regard as "the doctrines of the Reformation." Surely you will not decide in favor of the Augsburg Confession — without many exceptions — though that embraced the belief of the first mover of the Reformation; was published before either of the others, — and according to Mosheim, "was first adopted by the whole body of Protestants as the rule of their faith." (Vol. IV. p. 92.) Much less will you accord this high honor to the doctrines of Zuingle, although these too were announced before Calvin's. After reading, as I have done attentively, your volume, I cannot suppose you would pronounce that man's system of faith sound and pure, who believed as Zuingle did, "that the kingdom of heaven was open to all, who lived according to the dictates of right reason," * — and who is reported to have taught "that salvation was extended to heathens of a virtuous and moral life." But I need not multiply questions. 'T is evident that you consider *Calvin's system* to have embraced the doctrines of the Reformation. But how do you determine this matter? Have you any other reason than your preference? Calvin was younger than several other of the Reformers, both in years and in services. Nor was he any wiser or better a man than many, if not most, of them. Unless it has been revealed to you, Sir, I cannot conceive how you should know, he was right.' — pp. 31, 32.

Mr. May allows that 'it is not usual to see the names of Socinus and Servetus on the illustrious list of Reformers,' and

* Mosheim Vol. iv. p. 358.

he then goes on to prove their full right to a place there, and concludes with the following pithy interrogation.

'Seeing, then, that "the origin of Socinianism may be traced to the earliest period of the Reformation," (Mosheim IV. 470.) and that "the first founders and patrons of this sect were eminently distinguished by their learning and genius," (IV. 506.) and that there is as much evidence of their piety, as of the piety of either of that illustrious band of men, who achieved our independence of the spiritual despot, why, I ask, has not Socinianism an equal claim with Calvinism, to be regarded as the doctrine of the Reformation?' — p. 33.

The two following paragraphs, full of good sense and strong argument, finish the Third Letter.

'Will you, Sir, still persist in calling your "doctrines of Grace" the doctrines of the Reformation? Some of them, I grant, were maintained by several of the Reformers. But they were not peculiar to them. The Romish church still retained a part of the same — and they were all known to learned theologians as the product of the fourth century. Athanasius and St. Augustine were in fact the fathers of that system, for which you claim so high honor. And if that system was revived by Luther * and Calvin, there is reason to believe they did it, more on the authority of those distinguished Rabbis, than of Christ and his Apostles. So Dr. Muenscher seems to think, if I rightly understand him. "The Reformers" meaning Luther, Calvin, and those who agreed with them in most respects, "declared themselves disposed, in no respect whatever, to depart from the views of the Trinity, laid down in the ancient creeds; and *they instituted no new investigations of this doctrine*, because they had no contests about it with the Catholics." (*Elements Dogmatic of History*, p. 169. Again on page 174.) "In regard to the doctrine concerning the person of Christ, the Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed, all remained true to the ancient belief, *as defined by the decrees of Councils.*" (Page 175.) "On all the doctrines relating to the nature of man, sin, grace, redemption, and the divine decrees, the first reformers aimed to restore the pure tenets of Augustine; and to divest them of the adulterations and modifications, introduced by the schoolmen." (Page 178.) "On the doctrine concerning grace, Luther followed the views of Augustine in all their extent."

'* Luther, you know, was originally, a monk of the order of St. Augustine.'

'It seems then, that the system of divinity, now called Calvinism, was taught, in its essential principles, by Augustine, nearly four hundred years after Christ. And as there are no traces of it in the primitive churches, and it is nowhere stated in the New Testament, the peculiar honor of having drawn up such a system seems to rest upon that distinguished Father. Surely you cannot continue, with truth, to claim in praise of the Reformers, that they either invented or discovered "the doctrines of grace." But you may claim for them a higher praise. You may claim, and none will dare gainsay you, that the Reformers asserted for every man the right to examine, in the light of revelation, these, or any doctrines, which may be propounded to his faith, however venerable for their antiquity, or sustained in their authority by long lists of pious and learned men. He may, nay he ought to examine them for himself, and reject them, if he cannot find that Christ or his Apostles taught them. Our deference to the wise and good, of past ages, or of our own times, may very properly be such as may induce us to ponder well their opinions; to examine thoroughly the reasons, upon which they rest. If, however, we acquiesce in them, without being thoroughly convinced of their truth, we may be the disciples of some Apollos, or Cephas, but we cannot justly be considered the disciples of Christ. "What should we have to do with Luther? What should we have to do with Calvin? We profess the Gospel. We believe the Gospel."'*

In the Fourth Letter, the writer proves by irrefragable historical testimony, that the Pilgrims, as well as the Reformers, were principally moved to their enterprise by their determination not to submit to human imposition in matters of religion, and by a desire to escape from the immoral practices rather than the theological sentiments of Europe. This letter, however, and the Fifth, we must leave to those who may be induced by our recommendation to read the whole pamphlet. We hope that it will be read by many, and are convinced that it cannot be read by any without profit.

'* The above passage is quoted from a letter written in 1637, by the very learned and pious John Norton, minister of the First Church in Boston, and signed by *forty-four*, nearly all the then ministers of New England. It was written in answer (as Cotton Mather says) to a letter from the famous John Dury, a Scotch divine, who for many years labored to effect a reconciliation, between the different denominations of Protestants. See Samuel Mather's "Liberty of the Churches. Appendix, III."'

ART. III. — ORIGENIS *Opera Omnia, quæ Græcè vel Latinè tantum extant, et ejus Nomine circumferuntur.* Operâ et studio Caroli Delarue. Parisiis. 1733 – 1759. 4 vol. fol.

ORIGEN, called Adamantius, on account of his strength of mind and incredible labors, was a native of Egypt, and, as it has been generally supposed, of Alexandria, though this is not expressly affirmed by any ancient writer. He was born in the year 184 or 185, probably the latter, and while yet a child, exhibited that patience of labor, inquisitive spirit, and ardor, which marked his future years. He was early instructed by his father, Leonides, in the rudiments of the sciences, but his attention was particularly directed to the Scriptures. He was required every day to commit a portion of them to memory, and seems often to have perplexed his father with deep questions about the sense. For this he made show of chiding him, and told him that he must remain satisfied with the plain and obvious meaning of what he read, and not engage in researches beyond his years. But the overflowings of parental affection could not be repressed; and the happy father, restrained by a sense of duty to his child from manifesting all he felt, was accustomed to avail himself of the opportunity while he slept, of repairing to his couch, and, bending over him, would kiss his breast, in reverence of the divine spirit which lay enshrined there.

Eusebius, who has preserved some notices * of his life, gathered, as he informs us, partly from his letters, and partly from the reports of his pupils, of whom some still survived in his day, dwells at some length on the evidences of piety, and zeal in the cause of Christianity, exhibited by the youthful Origen. From the commencement of the bloody persecution under Severus, he freely exposed himself to danger, and seemed to court the crown of martyrdom. His mother became alarmed for his safety, and used every method of remonstrance and entreaty, to inspire him with reserve and caution. In vain she urged a mother's love. Unable to restrain his ardor, particularly after his father had been thrown into prison, she at last resorted to the artifice of hiding his

* Hist. Eccles. L. vi.

clothes, in consequence of which he was compelled to remain at home. But his thoughts were still active, and the zeal of a martyr burned in his breast. Debarred the privilege of visiting his father in prison, he composed and sent him a letter full of noble and elevated sentiments on the subject of martyrdom, and especially urging him to constancy. The letter has perished, but a single sentence of it, preserved by Eusebius, sufficiently indicates the strain in which it was written. 'Beware, that you do not change your purpose on account of us,' was the language it employed. Leonides remained firm, and by his death, A. D. 202, and the confiscation of his goods which followed, Origen, at about seventeen years of age, with six brothers, and his now widowed mother, was reduced at once to extreme poverty. *

He soon found a friend in a noble and opulent lady of Alexandria, who took him to her house and generously provided for his wants. She had, however, previously adopted as her son one Paul, originally of Antioch, a celebrated personage, says Eusebius, but unfortunately an arch-heretic. Yet such were the charms of his eloquence, that his society was generally sought, and multitudes pressed to hear his discourses. Origen was compelled to converse with him; but being from a child 'sound in the faith' himself, and 'abominating all heretical doctrines,' says the historian just alluded to, he could never be induced to assist him in prayer. † Whether his aversion to Paul induced him voluntarily to withdraw, or his patroness, finding him a troublesome guest, dismissed him, we are not informed. He soon left her, and obtained a support by teaching grammar. He also gave instruction on the subject of the Christian religion to such of the Pagans as were desirous of receiving it. For this task he was in some measure qualified by the pious care of his father, and his own studious habits, and from having been, when a boy, a pupil of Clement, who for several years presided over the Christian school at Alexandria, with no ordinary fame. Clement, however, had now retired or been driven from the province, and the most eminent Christians having been put to death, or dispersed by the terrors of the persecution, the catechetical chair remained vacant. At this time Origen, being now in his eighteenth year, took

* Jerome, Cat. Script. Eccles. † Hist. L. vi. c. 2.

possession of it,* surrounded as it was with danger, and was afterwards, as Jerome informs us, confirmed in the office by Demetrius, his bishop.† Of his early pupils several, in a short time, obtained the honors of martyrdom, some while yet receiving the rudiments of Christianity. Among the latter was a female by the name of Herais, who, to use Origen's expression, 'received baptism by fire.'

That the youthful and ardent Origen escaped with his life, appears almost miraculous, for his labors in the cause of Christianity were open and unremitted. He continued to make converts, and when they were apprehended and thrown into prison, he sought them out, and afforded them the consolation of his presence and conversation. He sometimes followed them to the place of execution, and was with them in their last moments. His boldness, indeed, seems to have been near costing him his life. He became an object of popular hatred, on account of the number of converts, who resorted to his standard. For a time he was hotly pursued; he fled from house to house for shelter, and, as Eusebius seems to intimate, was compelled to leave the city. If so, however, his absence was short. His sufferings served only to increase the flame of his piety, and the multitudes who were eager to listen to his eloquent expositions of the Christian faith, daily augmented. About this time, he broke up his grammar school, finding that his attention to his pupils interfered with his devotion to sacred learning, and with his duties as a teacher of religion. He also sold his library of heathen authors, which is said to have been choice and extensive, for the sum of five pence a day to be paid by the purchaser. On this he subsisted for many years, subjecting himself to fatigue and labors during the day, and consuming the greater part of the night in study. He often slept on the earth, disdaining the effeminacy of a bed. He interpreted rigorously, to the letter, some of the precepts of our Saviour, which have been generally considered as either local and temporary, or as requiring to be somewhat modified in their application to practice. Among them were those, in which he exhorts his disciples, as Eusebius expresses it, not to have two coats, nor to wear shoes, nor be solicitous about the time to come. Another instance of his absurd

* Euseb. Hist. L. vi. c. 3. † Cat. Script. Eccles.

compliance with the letter of the command, for which he afterwards blamed himself, is sufficiently well known. In fact, he imposed on himself the most severe restraints, going barefooted for many years, and abstaining from wine and all generous food. His friends were alarmed for the consequences, and begged him, with tears and grief for his apparent misery, to accept of their substance for the supply of his wants. But he persevered till symptoms of impaired health at length convinced him of his folly and danger. *

His ascetic and 'philosophical course of life,' as it is called, contributed to heighten the effect produced by his fervid genius and eloquence, and he obtained an unbounded popularity and influence.

At what period he listened to the instructions of Ammonius Saccas, the celebrated Platonic philosopher, we are not informed. It was probably not until some time after he had entered on his labors as master of the catechetical school. That he was for some time his pupil is expressly asserted by Porphyry, as quoted by Eusebius, † and may be inferred from a letter of Origen himself, part of which is preserved by the same historian. ‡ Among the disciples of Ammonius, however, there appears to have been another of the same name, who, as is generally admitted by the best modern critics, has been unjustly confounded with Origen Adamantius. The latter had, no doubt, acquired a partiality for the Platonic philosophy, as then taught in Egypt, under his early preceptor Clemens. This partiality was confirmed in the school of Ammonius, from whom, and from the writings of Plato and other philosophers, which were now constantly in his hands, having imbibed, says Porphyry, the 'allegorical mode of explaining the Grecian mysteries, he applied it to the Jewish Scriptures.' Of his proficiency in the Platonic and Ammonian philosophy, however, and the unnatural and absurd expositions of the language of the Bible, to which he and his fellow-laborers resorted, in order to reduce its doctrines into harmony with that corrupt and fanciful system, we have testimony less exceptionable than that of Porphyry. But we shall have occasion to advert to this topic hereafter, especially in treating of the opinions of this celebrated father.

After the death of Severus, Origen allowed himself the

* Euseb., L. vi. c. 3. † Hist. L. vi. c. 19. ‡ Ib.

relaxation of a journey to Rome, having a desire, as he expresses it, to 'see the most ancient church of the Romans.' This journey, as Eusebius and Jerome inform us, took place while Zephyrinus was bishop of Rome, that is, some time before the year 219. After a short stay, he returned to Alexandria, where he resumed his duties as catechist; Demetrius, his bishop, urging him to diligence, 'little less than beseeching him to labor earnestly for the good of the brethren.'* Soon after this the increasing multitudes, by which he was continually surrounded from morning till evening, made it necessary for him to engage an assistant. The person appointed to the office was Heraclas, formerly Origen's pupil, his fellow-student under Ammonius, and afterwards bishop of Alexandria. Origen continued to give instruction in the more recondite doctrines, to the higher classes, the task of teaching the simpler and more elementary principles being committed to his associate, who still, however, as Jerome tells us, continued to wear the philosophic garb.

From this time, Origen devoted himself with great ardor to the study of the sacred writings, and as a preparatory step, set about acquiring some knowledge of the Hebrew language. He is mentioned as the earliest among the fathers, who attempted to obtain an acquaintance with this language, and by 'what he did in it,' says Jerome, 'acquired fame all over Greece.' The taste of his nation and age opposed a barrier to acquisitions of this sort. The Hebrew language and literature bore among the Greeks the epithet *barbaric;* but Origen had the courage, in this instance, to despise the silly prejudices of the times. Though he never appears to have become a profound critic in Hebrew (and his knowledge of it, compared with that of more modern scholars, was superficial and scanty), yet taking into view the character of the age, we must allow, that his efforts entitle him to no mean praise. The Greek version of the Seventy, as it was called, was to Christians of his time, what the English version of King James's translators is to common Christians of the present day. But errors had crept into the text, and Origen, as we shall hereafter see, applied his knowledge of Hebrew, whatever it was, to the very laudable purpose of removing them. This was the origin of the Hexapla, for which he probably began to collect materials about this time.

* Euseb. Hist. L. vi. c. 14.

Origen's acquaintance with Ambrose, which was formed before he left Alexandria, and which soon ripened into the warmest friendship, was destined to exert a marked influence over his future studies and efforts. 'Ambrose,' says Jerome, 'was of a noble family, and of no mean and inelegant genius,' as his letters to Origen testify. Eusebius calls him a Valentinian, others a Marcionite; * but becoming a hearer of Adamantius, he was soon converted by him to the true faith. His admiration of Origen was unbounded. He often pressed him to write, and furnished him with materials and amanuenses, and many of Origen's treatises were dedicated to him.

The fame of Origen was now wide spread, and it drew around him, as we are told, † a multitude of heretics, and not a few Gentile philosophers, some of them men of repute. For besides divinity, he at this time taught geometry, mathematics, and all parts of secular learning, embracing the tenets of the various philosophical sects, through which he conducted his hearers, commenting on the most distinguished writers of each sect, and explaining the principles of all. He thus obtained the reputation of a philosopher among the Pagans. He was an advocate for the study of philosophy and secular literature, thinking that they formed a good preparation for the investigation of divine truth. He, therefore, cheerfully received all who applied to him for instruction, hoping, while teaching them human science, to be able to imbue their minds with a respect for the Christian faith. In this benevolent design he seems to have often succeeded.

His devotion to philosophy, as appears from a letter he wrote in apology for himself, to which we have already alluded as preserved by Eusebius, did not escape censure. In this letter he justifies his attention to secular learning on the ground of its utility. For, as many heretics, and others, skilled in the Grecian philosophy, resorted to him, it seemed desirable, and almost a matter of necessity, that he should thoroughly investigate the principles of the several philosophical sects. He, moreover, appeals to examples, and among others to that of Pantænus, formerly prefect of the catechetical school;

* The two sects had a great affinity with each other. They had a common origin in the Gnostic philosophy, and preserved many principles in common.

† Euseb. Hist. L. vi. c. 18.

and as this is the most ancient instance to which he alludes, we are authorized to infer, that Pantænus was the earliest of the Egyptian Christians of note, who engaged in the cultivation of Pagan literature. But the taste for philosophy thus introduced was destined not to be soon extinct. Clement, the master of Origen, and, as we have seen, Origen himself, a greater name, contributed their influence to diffuse and perpetuate it. A controversy for some years existed between the friends and enemies of philosophical studies; but the advocates of philosophy triumphed, and the consequence was, the simplicity of the Christian faith was corrupted, and an infinity of errors, especially during the prevalence of the doctrine of the later Platonists, of the school of Ammonius, flowed into the church.

While Origen was engaged in pursuing his laborious occupations as above described, at Alexandria, a soldier arrived, bearing letters from an Arabian Prince, to whose ears his fame had penetrated. These letters were addressed to Demetrius, the bishop, and to the prefect of Egypt, and contained a request that Origen might be speedily sent to impart to him a knowledge of his doctrine. The request was complied with, and Origen visited Arabia, and having accomplished the purpose of his journey, immediately returned.*

The cruel Caracalla now filled the throne of the Cæsars, and having, as he conceived, cause of displeasure against the Alexandrians, he determined on their destruction. Not thinking it safe to remain in Egypt, Origen retired into Palestine, and fixed his abode at Cæsarea. He was received there with demonstrations of great respect, and was urged by the bishops to preach and expound the Scriptures publicly in their presence. With this request he complied, though he had not yet received ordination. Demetrius was offended at this act of presumption, as he considered it, and wrote letters of remonstrance to the bishops of Palestine, in which he asserted that the transaction was without parallel. It was an unheard-of thing, he said, for a layman to preach in the presence of bishops. To this, Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus, bishop of Cæsarea, tell him, in reply, that he was mistaken, and proceed to specify several instances, in which laymen had been invited to preach and

*Euseb., L. vi. c. 19.

expound the Scriptures, by bishops, in their presence. Demetrius was not satisfied with the defence, and Origen was recalled to Alexandria. If Eusebius is correct in his reference to the massacre of the Alexandrians by Caracalla, Origen could not at this time have much exceeded thirty years of age. * Caracalla perished A. D. 217, and the massacre alluded to took place not long before his death.

After the accession of Alexander Severus to the empire of the Romans, A. D. 222, at the age of seventeen years, his mother, the pious Mammæa, as she is called, though a Pagan, being then at Antioch, and inflamed with a desire to converse with a man now universally known and admired, sent a military guard to ensure his safety and escort him to her presence. After remaining some time, and discoursing with her on the subject of the Christian doctrine, he again resumed his studies in Egypt. †

It was at this time, as the historian, already so often referred to, informs us, that the commentaries of Origen were commenced at the earnest request of his friend Ambrose, who maintained at his own expense more than seven amanuenses, who recorded at the dictation of Origen, and as many more copyists, besides girls, who transcribed in a fair hand what the others had hastily written. He had thus composed several volumes, when his labors were interrupted by a journey into Greece, whither he was sent, for the purpose of counteracting the designs of certain heretics then in high repute there. On his way to Greece he visited Palestine, and the before mentioned bishops of Jerusalem and Cæsarea testified their regard for him by ordaining him presbyter, ‡ at the age, it seems, of about forty-two, or forty-three. This act, we are told, though unsolicited on the part of Origen, gave great offence to his bishop, who had long cherished, in secret, a mean jealousy of his learning and great fame. He complained of his ordination by foreign bishops, without his consent, as irregular and disrespectful to himself, and from this moment he did not disguise his hatred of the presbyter. Origen pursued his journey, during which he visited Athens, where he frequented the schools of philosophy, and conversed with the most eminent sages. After a short stay in Greece

* Hist. L. vi. c. 19. † Ib. c. 21.
‡ Euseb., L. vi. c. 23. Jerome, Cat. Eccles. Script.

he returned to Egypt. In a synod soon after assembled by his exasperated bishop, however, he was forbidden any longer to teach in Alexandria, and was commanded to leave the city. A decree was afterwards passed, as we are informed, by the bishops of the province, at the instigation of Demetrius, deposing him from the office of priest, and pronouncing against him sentence of excommunication.

This decree was followed by letters written by the enraged bishop to all parts of Christendom, the object of which was to cause Origen to be cut off from the communion of the whole Christian world. His malice was in part though not wholly effectual. The majority of bishops extended their sanction to the absurd decrees alluded to, it being customary, as it was asserted, to respect the decisions of a provincial synod, without an examination of the reasons on which they were founded. The bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem, however, as also those of Arabia, Phœnicia, and Greece, the old friends of Origen, still adhered to him, despising the anathemas of the synods of Egypt. In these several provinces Origen was still allowed to discharge the functions of priest.

Demetrius did not long survive to enjoy his triumphs, or mourn over his defeat. He died soon after Origen had bidden adieu to Alexandria, and was succeeded in the bishopric by Heraclas, who was promoted to that office, as Eusebius tells us,* on account of his deep knowledge of Pagan literature and philosophy, a circumstance which shows the esteem, in which secular learning was then held by the Alexandrian Christians. Heraclas, we have said, was the pupil and friend of Origen, and he had succeeded him, before he was made bishop, in the catechetical school. But notwithstanding his regard for his old preceptor, now the most celebrated man of the age, the sentence of excommunication pronounced against him by the synod, was not revoked during his life, nor by his successor, Dionysius, also one of Origen's scholars; and Origen was ever therefore regarded by the Egyptians, as an excommunicated person.

The whole ground of complaint against him appears to have been what was regarded an act of presumption and disrespect for his bishop, in consenting to receive ordination at the hands of foreign bishops, without his consent. He was

* L. vi. c. 31.

not charged with either immorality or heresy. The story, set afloat some time after, that he had consented, in an evil hour, to offer incense to idols, and that the contempt and ridicule, which this act of wickedness brought on him, compelled him to leave Egypt, is entitled to no credit. It is related by Epiphanius, a very credulous writer of the fourth century, and seems to have been invented by the enemies of Origen, some years after his death. The story is in itself, and in the several circumstances which attend it, highly improbable; it is alluded to by none of the more ancient writers, even those most hostile to the fame of Origen, and is utterly at variance with the testimony of Eusebius, Jerome, and other writers entitled to most respect. The orthodox Jerome, about a hundred and fifty years after the death of Origen, says expressly, in allusion to the proceedings against him at Alexandria, that he was condemned 'not on account of the novelty of his dogmas; not on account of heresy, for which he is now barked at by the rabid dogs, but because they could not endure the fame of his eloquence and learning.'*

Origen left Egypt soon after the year 230, when a little more than forty-five years of age. He retired to Cæsarea in Palestine, where he continued to preach with the approbation of the bishops of the province. Here he opened a school, in which he taught, as before, philosophy and religion. His pupils from Palestine, and from places the most remote from it, were numerous, and some of them afterwards attained celebrity. Among them were Gregory, called Thaumaturgus, *the Wonder-worker*, and his brother Athenodorus. They are described by Eusebius as having been passionately fond of the Roman and Greek learning. The former was engaged in the study of the Roman law, at Berytus, where he became acquainted with Origen, by whose persuasive eloquence he was induced to abandon it, and transfer his affection to divinity. He was accompanied by his brother. They remained five years with Origen, and afterwards became, while yet young, bishops in Pontus,† their native country.‡

---

*Epist. 29, ad Paulam. †Euseb. Hist. L. vi. c. 30.

‡Thaumaturgus has left sufficient testimony of his veneration and love of Origen in a 'Panegyrical Oration,' which he delivered on his departure, a somewhat extravagant and inflated performance, but interesting from the subject, and the occasion, on which it was delivered. It was pronounced, it seems, in the presence of Origen, and is a lofty

Origen now pursued his design of writing commentaries, being engaged, as Eusebius tells us, on Isaiah and Ezekiel. The latter were finished some time after at Athens. Hé had previously, and while at Alexandria, written his book 'De Principiis,' his 'Stromata' in imitation of Clement, and parts of his expositions on Genesis, and on the Gospel of John.*

During the persecution under Maximin, A. D. 235, he appears to have consulted his safety by withdrawing himself from Palestine. It was at this time probably that he accepted the invitation of Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, to visit that place. He remained there some time, employed on his Hexapla. We find him afterwards at Bostra, in Arabia, whither he had been summoned with several other bishops, to hold a conference with Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, who defended the opinion then generally discarded by the learned, that Jesus Christ had no proper subsistence before his appearance on earth, and was divine only by virtue of the divinity of the Father residing in him. Origen had the ingenuity and address, says his historian, to convince him of his error, for which he afterwards expressed his thanks by letter. Several documents relating to this conference, and particularly the dialogue, which passed between Beryllus and Origen, are mentioned by Jerome,† as extant in his time, but of which we have now to regret the loss.

Another council was afterwards holden in Arabia, at which

---

encomium on his merits, written, however, with warmth, and apparently with great sincerity of feeling. The circumstances, which led to the first interview of his pupils with him, his efforts to detain them, his bland and insinuating eloquence, his animated description of the nature and end of true philosophy, his praises of it, his benignant temper, his urbanity and modesty, by all which their admiration was awakened and their affections won; their resolution to abandon their former studies, and remain with this fascinating man; the method he pursued with them, his mode of instruction in philosophy, ethics, and theology, his profound wisdom and piety, and their regret on leaving him, — are among the topics introduced. The expulsion of Adam from Paradise, and the misery endured by the Jews in Babylon, are among the extravagant similes employed to express their sense of the loss they should sustain on being deprived of his counsels and presence. The piece is disfigured by all the faults of the Asiatic style, but as a panegyric on Origen, by one of his most ardent admirers, and one who had opportunity of thoroughly knowing him, it becomes an object of curiosity.

* Euseb., L. vi. c. 24, 25. † Cat. Script. Eccles., art. *Beryllus.*

Origen was present, being called to refute the opinion maintained by some Arabian Christians, that the soul dies, and is raised with the body. *

Thus, if a cloud hung over his fame in Egypt and the West, he had the consolation of knowing, that he was still regarded with unbounded admiration in the East.

Origen returned to Palestine. He was now, according to Eusebius, more than sixty years of age, † yet did not relax the industry, which through life formed one of the most prominent features of his character. His powers were yet in their full vigor, and among the works produced after this period were some of his best. His celebrated work against Celsus, undertaken at the request of Ambrose, was one of the number. He continued also to write commentaries. The subjects on which he was now employed were Matthew's Gospel, and the twelve minor Prophets.

Having from long use acquired the habit of speaking *extempore* with great accuracy, he now, for the first time, permitted the discourses delivered by him in public to be taken down and published by reporters and copyists. ‡ These homilies were delivered almost every day, § and the number thus preserved, and transmitted to posterity, as a monument of his diligence, amounted, we are told, to more than a thousand. ‖

Origen was not allowed to finish his days in peace. The persecution under Decius had commenced, during which Alexander, the aged bishop of Jerusalem, Origen's firm and tried friend, perished in prison. Origen himself was confined in chains in the inmost recesses of a prison, and subjected to exquisite torture by the rack, the most consummate skill being exerted to push his sufferings to the utmost point of endurance, without causing his death. ¶ He bore all, however, with immovable constancy, though now sixty-five years of age; and the death of Decius, as may be conjectured, finally procured his release. Worn out with years, toil, and sufferings, he sunk quietly to rest, at Tyre, at the age, says Eusebius, of sixty-nine years, ** A. D. 254. His remains were deposited, as tradition says, in the cathedral church of

---

* Euseb. Hist. L. vi. c. 37. † Ib. c. 36. ‡ Ib. c. 26.
§ Apol. Pamph. pro Orig. ‖ Jerome, Epist. 41. al. 65. ad Pammach.
¶ Euseb., L. vi. c. 39. ** L. vii. c. 1. See also Jerome, Cat. Script.

the Holy Sepulcre, at Tyre, near the great altar. A marble column, bearing his name and epitaph, and adorned with gold and gems, was visible, it is said, so late as near the end of the thirteenth century; but all vestiges of the tomb have long since disappeared. *

Ambrose, his distinguished patron and admirer, died before him, and was censured, says Jerome, because though rich, he bequeathed nothing to his friend, who was then poor and old. The censure may have been unjust. Origen, as we have seen, in early life remained in a state of voluntary poverty, and persevered in resisting the earnest entreaties of his friends to partake of the gifts of their liberality. He probably retained, in age, the feelings and views by which he was influenced in youth, and Ambrose, therefore, forbore to offer what he knew his friend would refuse to accept.

The foregoing narrative embodies all that is known of the personal history of Origen Adamantius. Of the chronological order of several of the incidents related, there exists some uncertainty. Eusebius, from whom the greater part of the materials for a life of Origen must be drawn, is very sparing of dates, and his narrative, though on some points copious, is not a little confused. Jerome in the very brief account of this Father, inserted in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, has preserved a few dates, but in the order of his narration often differs from Eusebius.

Of Origen's genius and character we shall not attempt any labored analysis. The prominent features of both are well known, and several of them have been incidentally noticed in the above sketch of his life. That he had qualities fitted to inspire admiration and love can be doubted by none. His merits won him many distinguished and warm friends, and it should be mentioned as equally to their credit and to his, that many of them remained true to him in the hour of his greatest adversity. He was regarded by multitudes with extravagant fondness, yet amid the marks of flattering attention which he was daily receiving, he appears to have retained, in a remarkable degree, his natural simplicity and modesty. He was pursued in his life time,

* Huet. Orig., L. i. c. 4, § 9, note. Maundrell found remains of a church, supposed to be the cathedral, in 1697; but, according to a more recent traveller, they are no longer to be seen.

as was his memory after his death, by envy and hate; he was abused, anathematized, and driven from his country; but seems to have contracted no bitterness or misanthropy of feeling. If it be the lot of few to experience to an equal extent the extremes of adulation and censure, few will be found to exhibit brighter examples of moderation and self-command. Of the amenity of his disposition, his blandness, and winning address, his history and writings afford us abundant evidence.

His piety cannot be questioned, though he has never been allowed to bear the title of saint in the Romish Calendar, and the question has been seriously debated whether he won heaven by his merits, or is doomed to the penal fires of hell for his errors!* Such is human folly and absurdity. He

* 'There are many divines in the communion of Rome,' says Bayle, 'who believe this Father is in hell.' And the sceptical writer proceeds to amuse himself and his readers, with several curious extracts and references. One is from Dallæus's reply to M. Cottibi, whom he convicted of ignorance of Christian antiquity in applying the title of *Saint* to Origen, which he never bore. We will give a short specimen. 'It is scarce 200 years since Johannes Picus Mirandulanus, having published at Rome, among his nine hundred propositions, that it is more reasonable to believe Origen's salvation, than his damnation, was thereupon taken up by the doctors in divinity, who affirmed that this conclusion is rash and blameworthy.'

'The Jesuit Stephen Binet,' says the same writer, 'publishing a book at Paris in 1629, concerning the salvation of Origen, durst not take the affirmative without trembling. He lays out the matter in the form of an indictment and trial, and produces the witnesses and pleaders, pro and con, with the intervention of the conclusion of the King of heaven's council. At last he brings in this verdict. Considering all that has been said on one side and the other, and the conclusions of the King of heaven's council, it is decreed, that the affair be left to God's secret council, to whom the definitive sentence is reserved. Nevertheless by provision, and for the benefit of Origen, it is judged, upon the balance of the whole, that the proofs of his salvation are stronger and more conclusive than those of his damnation.' This we suppose may be considered as, on the whole, a very judicious verdict. We will next give a short extract from the arguments of the council for and against Origen. The following passage, taken from the vision of a 'good and honest' abbot in the 'Pratum Spirituale,' a book cited with apparent approbation by a general council, occurs in the argument of the council against him. 'A good man, under great concern about the salvation of Origen's soul, did, after the ardent prayer of a holy old man, plainly see a sort of hell laid open to him, where he distinguished and knew the heresiarchs, who were all called over before him by their names; and in the midst of these he saw Origen, who lay there damn-

led a life of uncommon sanctity and abstemiousness, treading under foot the wealth and pleasures of earth, and leaving monuments of zeal, diligence, and constancy, which will endure while the religion he labored to defend and illustrate has an abode in the world.

His intellectual character is strongly marked. He seemed formed to exemplify the greatness and imbecility of human nature. As a writer his merits and defects are alike conspicuous. He had a quick and comprehensive understanding, subtilty and penetration, a memory uncommonly tenacious, a rapid and teeming imagination, and a fervid and enthusiastic temperament. But he was wanting in sound judgment, in accuracy and method. He threw off his compositions in haste, or rather dictated them *extempore* to his numerous scribes, whom he fatigued by his celerity and protracted labors, day and night; and what was once committed to writing, seems never to have been subjected to revision. Prolixity and verboseness, diffuseness and redundancy in matter and style, were the inevitable consequence. These defects run through all his writings, but characterize particularly his commentaries. Hence one of his enemies, after his death, took occasion to say, that he left the world the 'heritage of his garrulity as a pestiferous possession.' *

As a critic and expositor he is entitled to little respect. His fondness for allegory and mysticism amounted to a sort of phrensy. His learning was vast, but he had too little discrimination in the use of it; and his attachment to the corrupt philosophy then prevalent in Egypt was the means of contaminating all his views of theology. Under the name of Christianity he retailed most of the reveries and extravagancies of the Alexandrian Platonists of the school of Potamon and Ammonius.

With all his defects, however, we cannot withhold from him

---

ed among the rest, and covered with horror, flames, and confusion!' To this the counsel on the part of Origen reply, 'Here the vision of a simple abbot is alleged, and I allege the vision of a great saint, called Mechtildis, to whom God revealed that he would not have the world to know what was become of Samson, Solomon, and Origen, with the intent to strike the greatest terror into the strongest, the wisest, and the most learned men of this world, by keeping them in suspense and uncertainty.' Poor Origen!

* Theophilus of Alexandria. Lib. Pasch. I.

a title to the praise of extraordinary genius. He was among the great men of his age, and would have been great in any age. The germ of most of his errors, as we have intimated, existed in the prevalent modes of thinking, and are such as a person possessing a bold, ardent, and speculative mind, united with precipitancy of judgment, but with great goodness of heart, placed in the circumstances of Origen, might very naturally adopt. They appear monstrous to us, because they have passed away and our minds have not been familiar with them from infancy. They have vanished before the lights of modern science, but errors equally extravagant, perhaps, yet linger among us. We could mention many opinions now current among Christians, which rest on no more solid foundation than did the errors of Origen and the Fathers, which we contemplate with so much surprise. They are mere human speculations, of a character sufficiently revolting; and our familiarity with them as articles of popular belief, alone prevents us from being shocked with their absurdity. They will gradually fade away and disappear, and when recalled by the historians of a future age, will be regarded with much the same feelings, with which we now view the vagaries of the early philosophical Christians. Yet with all his extravagancies, and they were great enough, Origen has much to delight and instruct us. 'I acquire more knowledge of Christian philosophy,' says Erasmus, 'from one page of Origen, than from ten of Augustine.'

Of several of Origen's writings only the title remains, and of many, even that seems to have perished. Eusebius informs us,* that he had inserted a catalogue of his works in his Life of Pamphilus, which is now lost; and Jerome, as we learn from himself, gave one in a letter to Paula, of which only a fragment has been preserved. Ancient writers speak of the number of volumes produced by him as vast and almost infinite. Rufinus and others make it amount to six thousand, but Jerome asserts,† that he did not find in Eusebius's catalogue one third part of that number. At the same time he bears ample testimony to the immense bulk of his writings. 'All Greek and Roman authors,' he tells us,

* Hist. L. vi. c. 32.
† Apol. adv. Ruf. L. ii.

'were surpassed by the labors of this one.' 'Who,' he asks, 'can read so much as he wrote?' *

His exegetical writings were of three kinds. The first were called Scholia, and consisted of brief notes, intended to illustrate the more difficult passages. The second, denominated Tomes, or Commentaries, were diffuse expositions of the several books of the Bible. In these, Origen indulged in full extent his fondness for recondite and mystical meanings. The third class consisted of Homilies, or Treatises, Tracts, as they were called by the Latins; in which he explained select portions of the sacred writings, in a style adapted to the popular ear.

His Commentaries exhibit little accuracy. Indeed the principle, on which he proceeded, precluded a sound and rational exposition of the language of his author. The greater part of Scripture contains, according to him, three senses; the literal or historical, or, as he frequently calls it, the corporeal; the mystical, allegorical, or spiritual; and the moral. Of the first he had but a very mean opinion. Going on this principle, it is not surprising that he became not a little visionary and wild. In fact, he mystifies and allegorizes almost every thing. Jerome accuses him of allegorizing Paradise in such a manner as to destroy the faith of history, by trees understanding angels, and by rivers celestial powers.† Again, by the garments of skins with which God is said, Gen. iii. 21, to have clothed Adam and Eve, he

* Epist. 29, ad Paulam. The account which supposes him to have written 6000 volumes seems, at first view, extravagant. That he might have produced that number, however, appears by no means impossible, when we consider that each of the homilies or discourses, which were, in some sort, *extempore* performances, and of which a thousand were given to the public by him after he was sixty years of age, seems to have been enumerated as a volume; and that his commentaries, which are said by Epiphanius to have extended to all the books of Scripture, and which, as we know from the remains of them now extant, were exceedingly diffuse, were divided into very small tomes. That these tomes were exceedingly numerous, is sufficiently evident from the fact that the first thirteen embraced only the three first and part of the fourth chapter of Genesis. By this method of distribution, it is obvious that the works of Origen would amount to a prodigous number of volumes, possibly even to 6000. Had he written less, his productions would have acquired in value what they lost in bulk.

† Epist. 38. al. 61. ad Pammach.

supposed were meant bodies, with which they became clothed after the fall, they having previously existed in Paradise without flesh and bones.* It should be observed, however, that Origen, in his commentary on the passage referred to, which is preserved, does not state this opinion as an undisputed dogma. He mentions a difficulty attending it; still he seems inclined to receive it.† By the waters which are said to be above the firmament we are to understand, according to him, the holy and supernal powers, and by those over and under the earth, the opposite and demoniacal.‡ To such an extent did he indulge his fondness for allegorical and tropological senses.§

---

* Epist. 38. al. 61. ad Pammach.

† Opp. T. II. p. 29.

‡ Jerome ad Pammach.

§ The following summary of Origen's principles of interpretation, is given, in substance, in Delarue's preface to his commentaries. Scripture has three senses, the literal, the moral, and the mystical or allegorical. In some parts the literal sense alone obtains, in others the moral, in others the mystical, in others the literal and the mystical united. Generally speaking, the literal sense is sufficient for the edification of the simple, but the letter often contains what is false, absurd, repugnant to itself, impossible, &c.; whence an infinity of errors have sprung. The mystical or allegorical sense is necessary to defend the truth of Scripture against its adversaries, and make it appear worthy of God. It is difficult, not to say impossible, to penetrate the mystical senses of Scripture. Yet there are certain rules, the observance of which will conduce to a knowledge of them. And, first, whatever is said relating to the ceremonial law is always to be understood not literally, but mystically. Again, whatever is said of Jerusalem, Egypt, Babylon, Tyre, and other places on earth, is to be referred wholly to corresponding places in heaven, where souls have a habitation. For in heaven is a region corresponding to Judea, a city corresponding to Jerusalem, a people corresponding to the Jewish people. There is a celestial Egypt, a celestial Babylon, a celestial Tyre and Sidon, and other cities and places of this sort, corresponding to cities and regions of the same name on earth. Finally, the mystical sense must be resorted to, and the letter deserted, whenever the latter appears false, unedifying, or unworthy of God. This summary is mostly taken from Origen's books 'Of Principles.' Origen appears not to have distinguished between the literal and the metaphorical sense, between what was meant to be understood strictly, according to the natural signification of the words, and what the views and purpose of the writer, the connexion of the discourse, and other considerations to be taken into view by the laws of approved criticism, require us to understand in a modified or restricted sense. He, therefore, often resorts to mystical or spiritual senses, when the supposition

Several of the Homilies and large fragments of the Tomes, or Commentaries, have been transmitted to us, constituting together nearly three fourths of all the works of Origen extant. Of a part we possess the original Greek, of other parts only the Latin translations of Rufinus, Jerome, and others. Those by Jerome are entitled to much respect, and those by Rufinus, for reasons stated below, to very little.

Of the other works of Origen one of the most considerable is the four books 'Of Principles.' The original of this is unfortunately lost. It was translated into Latin at the close of the fourth century by Rufinus, who, under the absurd pretext that it had been corrupted by the Arians, took the liberty of altering what did not please him. For this he was severely censured by Jerome, whom he had offended by some sinister praises bestowed on him in the preface, and which were designed to draw upon him the suspicion of Origenism. Rufinus admits that he had changed, expunged, and modified certain passages, which would not have been tolerated by Latin ears, but asserts that he had substituted others taken from the acknowledged writings of Origen. This Jerome denies, and Rufinus fails of proving; and much intemperate language passed between them. The result was that Jerome gave a new, and as he affirms, a faithful translation of the work in question. But this, with the exception of a few small fragments, has been suffered to perish, and for our knowledge of the work we are indebted almost solely to the corrupt version of Rufinus. The loss of the original is the more to be regretted, as this was one of Origen's most elaborate performances, was written after he had arrived at the full maturity of his powers, and con-

---

of a popular or figurative use of language would have answered his purpose quite as well. For example, commenting on Gen. iii. 21. in which it is said, 'Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them,' he says that it would be foolish, and unworthy of God, to suppose that he took the skins of animals slain or which had otherwise perished, and by sewing them together, reduced them to the form of a coat. He therefore resorts to a mystical sense. Now the foundation of his error, it is obvious, lay in the supposition, that it is necessary either to take the words of Moses in their most literal acceptation, or to assign to them an allegorical or mystical sense, that there was no medium between the two. The same error led to the absurd application of some of the precepts of the Saviour, alluded to near the commencement of this article.

tained a full exposition of his views respecting the nature of the Saviour.* The work, in its present form, can afford us little help in settling the question of the opinion of Origen on the interesting subject of the trinity. It was on this point that Rufinus undertook to correct it; on others, as Jerome informs us, he left Origen to speak his own sentiments.

Origen's great work was the Hexapla.† Of this work only a few fragments have come down to us. The original, which never seems to have been copied entire, was deposited in the library of Cæsarea, by Pamphilus, its founder. The library was destroyed during the irruption of the Saracens, and this monument of noble industry was thus lost to the world. The parts containing the corrected version of the Septuagint, had been transcribed by Eusebius and Pamphilus, with occasional extracts from other versions, but only fragments of these are now extant.

---

* Rufin. Invect. Jerome, Apol. adv. Rufin.

† The design of the Hexapla was to correct the text of the Greek version of the Old Testament, which was then in common use, but was found to contain many false readings, which occasioned some embarrassment in the controversies between the Christians and the Jews, who often appealed to the Hebrew original as differing from the version of the Seventy. For this purpose Origen collected all the versions of the Old Testament within his reach, which he transcribed and arranged in parallel columns. First stood the Hebrew text; then the same in Greek characters. This was followed by the very literal version of the Jew, Aquila, then recently published. The next column was occupied by the more free, but, as it is said, faithful translation of Symmachus, an Ebionite. Then followed the version of the Seventy, corrected by a comparison of it with the Hebrew text. After this stood the Greek version of Theodotion, also an Ebionite. To these he added two obscure anonymous versions then recently brought to light, and on the Psalms still another, making the seventh. The work was called Biblia Hexapla, either because it contained six versions, the fragment on the Psalms not being taken into the account; or because it was originally composed of six columns, the Hebrew text, and the same in Greek characters forming two, and the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, the Seventy, and Theodotion making up the remaining four. The two anonymous versions being afterwards added, it obtained the name of the Octapla, as it then consisted of eight columns, and finally of Enneapla, because, with the version of the Psalms last added, it exhibited nine. Eusebius informs us that Origen afterwards prepared the Tetrapla, consisting of the four principal versions already enumerated. In opposition, however, to this testimony, several modern critics have contended that the whole formed originally but one work, variously denominated according to the number of columns, or number of translations, entire or partial, which it contained.

The eight books 'Against Celsus' contain much good reasoning, and many acute and striking remarks. But Origen was trammelled by the superstitions and errors of the age. A belief of the power of magic, and force of names and incantations, was common as well among Christians as Pagans, and appeared sensibly to impair the evidence of Christianity from miracles. To this belief Origen was not superior. 'Magic,' he says, 'is not, as the disciples of Epicurus and Aristotle maintain, a futile thing, but certain and constant,' and belongs to a recondite theology.

Many of Celsus's objections, too, were levelled, as have been those of unbelievers since his time, not against Christianity itself, but against its corruptions, which even then abounded; and to these objections, Origen, of course, could furnish no satisfactory reply.

Again, several of the narrations of the Old and New Testament were treated by Celsus with levity and ridicule, and Origen thought to blunt the point of his weapons by interposing the shield of allegory and mysticism; and no doubt his esteem for allegory was increased by the vain belief that it would help to defend Scripture against profane cavils. But this was to yield the victory to the enemy. Minds formed after the mould of Celsus's were not to be convinced by these methods, which in their view only exposed the weakness of the cause they were meant to serve.* It should

* Beausobre has some just reflections on this subject. Alluding to a remark of Origen in his seventh homily on Leviticus, that if we adhere to the letter, and adopt the Jewish or vulgar exposition, we must blush to think that God has given such laws, since those of the Romans and Athenians were incomparably more equitable, he says, 'It must be acknowledged, that these confessions of the Fathers are very prejudicial to the Old Testament. The heretics, who were not prepossessed in favor of the Hebrew revelation, knew well how to profit by them, and had not docility enough to submit their reason and their faith to allegorical expositions. In fact, what authority, what evidence can allegories possess, which necessity alone invents, which are only the sport of imagination, only meteors formed, so to speak, of vapors exhaled by a spirit pressed with difficulties? The Christians derided the Gentiles, when, to conceal the shame of their religious fables, they pretended that they were only veils designed to envelope natural truths. It is not then surprising, that not only the Pagans, but heretics, in turn laughed at the orthodox, when, to defend the history and laws of Moses, they employed the weapons, which they had been the first to break in pieces.' *Histoire Critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme.* T. i. p. 287.

be recollected, however, that the design of the performance was less to convince minds of this sort, than to confirm weak, and perhaps faltering Christians.* With all its defects, however, it was a noble effort, and is generally esteemed the best defence of Christianity, which has descended to us from the early ages.

Of Origen's life and writings it is unnecessary to say more. We propose in a future number to give some account of his *opinions*, which may be regarded as a subject of curiosity and interest alike to the philosophical inquirer and the theologian.

[For the Christian Examiner.]

Art. IV. — *On the Morality of our Political Situation.*

As our present Number appears within a few days of the great political anniversary of the country, we embrace the opportunity to offer some remarks on the morality of our political situation; and as we are a little too early to review the Orations, we must even put forth our thoughts independently of them, and contribute our own mite to the great and interesting occasion.

Simple as the matter may seem to be, we believe it is no easy thing to form a just and true appreciation of political freedom. And we are persuaded that much will be done towards leading men to a right use of this favored condition, when they are brought rightly to consider it. It was under the influence of such an impression, without designing to overrate efforts of this nature so humble as ours must be, that we endeavoured some time since to show that liberty is not only a blessing, but a trust; and that, in fact, it never is or can be a blessing, but when used as a trust. In pursuance of the same general design, and to bring the principle we then stated to a still more practical application, we shall now undertake to show that freedom, rightly considered, implies not only the highest state of privilege, but the loftiest condition

---

* Celsus was dead when Origen wrote, as he informs us; Cont. Cel. Præf.

of duty. The prevailing habit of thought on this subject, has been to contemplate liberty almost exclusively as a blessing and a privilege. It is time — we must venture to say it with emphasis — it is time to leave our childish exultation; and in the sober manhood of freedom, to consider that it devolves upon us weighty trusts, and demands of us unquestionable and serious duties.

Indeed, to consider, to reflect, is itself one of the primary and indispensable duties of a freeman. He is not to reap the benefits of his condition from the operation of blind and unperceived causes. He is to consider and to understand from whence these benefits arise, and how they are to be preserved and perpetuated. He is to place no absolute or ultimate reliance on any mysterious Magna Charta, on any protecting Palladium, on any magic words written in the Constitution. No constitution can preserve *them* free, who are unfaithful to the duties of freemen. And little benefit would it confer on them if it could; for the very end of rational liberty is the noblest intellectual and moral action. The members of a free community are not, and cannot be, like the subjects of despotic rule, mere portions and parts of the machinery of society, moved by springs, not of their own making, nor of their own governing, nor for them to comprehend. They are themselves the springs, nay the sources of political action. The government is the expression of their will. Its movement is like that of the mighty ocean, where every drop and particle contributes to the combined strength and power.

Freemen must reflect, and they must act, wisely. They must reflect and act thus, in a great many cases, where other men have only to submit and obey. They have not to go before a Persian cadi, or a Turkish pacha, to receive a summary decision, right or wrong, upon their claims for justice. But they have to *make* the laws that govern them, to modify them according to the exigencies of their multiplying relations, to apply them to individual cases, to administer them according to the principles of truth and wisdom. And the laws that spring from free institutions — the laws, in other words, that are really and faithfully adapted to the wants of an enterprising, prosperous, and free people, will be numerous, precise, and complicated. There can be no greater mistake, and yet it is often committed, than to sup-

pose that the best laws, amidst the highest freedom, would be very few and simple. Where action is free, the relations of business will be many. Where rights are accurately defined, and carefully adjusted to all the mutual relations of persons and things, the distinctions made will often be delicate and abstruse, and require, in those who would regard them, so much the more intelligence and reflection.

The condition of freedom, rightly regarded, demands also the greatest strength of moral purpose. He that will rightly enjoy this privilege should have taken, for his task-masters, reason and conscience. He has no despot to say to him, 'Thou shalt do this, and this.' He has a law, indeed, but that law is of his own ordaining. He should feel the solicitude about its observance, which the creation, the authorship of it, fairly imposes. He, who had proposed any enactment in the halls of legislation, would feel as if it was especially incumbent on him to respect and obey it. So in his measure should every man feel, who has contributed, either directly or indirectly, to the legislation of his country. He should *keep* the rule, which he has helped to establish. The last man in the world to say, with blind and headlong passion, 'I will, or I will not,' — and yet this, by many, is thought to be the precise and special blessing of liberty, 'to do as they please,' — but we insist, that the last man to say or do this, should be the free man, the republican.

Let us illustrate the strictness and sobriety that belong to this condition in two or three instances. A man born in India is obliged, by the institution of *caste* in that country, to follow a certain occupation. In many countries, the pursuits of every individual, though not imposed on him by his birth, are controlled and fettered by arbitrary laws and vexatious restrictions. In every country, where a titled aristocracy is established, the path of honorable ambition is nearly hedged up in some directions, and in others entirely closed. Even in England, there is but a bare possibility open to the commoner, that he may enter the peerage. But to every man in a free country, 'the world,' comparatively, 'is all before him where to choose.' He may pursue any business; he may adopt any profession; he may set before himself any aim, even the highest. Such a state of things affords the largest scope for enterprise and competition in business, for domestic rivalship, and the contests of political

ambition. It is obviously a state of great temptation, and therefore, to be safe, must be a state of self-government, of self-denial, of strictness, of forbearance, of sobriety — of duty, in every form. If a free land is only made a field for the unrestrained conflicts of men's selfish interests; if it is only a battle-field for the rude and lawless passions, there will be haste and waste, disorder and desolation, instead of comfort, competence, and virtue. Our people, we are satisfied, do not sufficiently reflect on this. The eagerness of unfettered pursuit is carrying many too far; improvident and ambitious expenditures are ruining many more; the strife of boundless competition, between families, between rival claimants for office, and political parties, agitates society to its lowest depths. Every passion, in such circumstances, — the love of gain, the love of display, in dress, furniture, equipage, the desire of distinction, and the fear, too, of the all-ruling public, must be more strictly governed and guarded.

Again, let us refer to the freedom of speech and of the press. In despotic states, a man has need to take care what he says in the public streets, and what he inserts in the public prints; his lips are sealed by the suspected presence of spies and informers; and his pen, when he writes, is held by the hand of fear. In this country every man says and publishes *almost* every thing that he pleases. In such a state of things, what is to preserve our press and our conversation, in relation to the government, and all political matters, from reckless and dangerous extravagance and licentiousness? We know of nothing but the self-restraint of conscience and duty, the sober consideration of true lovers of their country. It may seem to many a very small matter, but we confess that it appears to us, that those who talk about our institutions and prospects, should talk soberly, with some effort to say things that are wise and true, and not with a view to give vent to their crude opinions and disappointed passions; that they should neither lean to the side of bold exultation, nor of rash discouragement. There was a time, when, for the purpose of arousing the people from their deep security, it seemed expedient to throw out hints of the possible destruction of that constitution, on which, and not on their moral habits, men were so securely reposing. But that time is past. There is now, on this topic, a freedom and familiarity of discussion in Congress as well as in humbler spheres of

influence,—there is a reckless language on this subject, going even to the extent of proposing to 'calculate the value of this union,' which, we do not say, is perilous, for we believe the danger of its dissolution is not great—we derive encouragement from the increasing knowledge, intercourse, union, sobriety, and virtue of the people—but it is language, we think, which it were better not to hear.

Freedom, we repeat, can truly consist, can safely stand, in nothing but in the sense of that duty, which we owe to it. If it is converted from its legitimate character, into the dissolution of that moral bond, it neither can be preserved, nor is it worth preserving. The strength of human hearts must bear it up. It is thus perfectly true, in the language of Scripture, that 'God is our defence; that the Lord of hosts is our refuge.' Freedom is one of the natural and noblest gifts of God to men; but if his grace, if his spirit; if his law is not in their hearts, the gift will be turned to abuse and ruin. If liberty is the mere fabric of human opinion, whose vigor no living energies supply, it will be like other architecture of human device, admired in its first novelty and beauty, mocked inits decay, forsaken in its dilapidation, and trodden under foot at last, in its utter prostration and ruin.

The character of the true freeman, be he political, social, or religious, is the loftiest form of human character. The great doctrine now to be taught to this people is, that they must raise themselves up to their favored condition, to their free institutions. This they have not yet done. They have not reflected enough; they are not intelligent enough; they have not yet enough virtue to realize, to obtain the full advantages of their condition. Society, neighbourhood, municipal community, trade, acquisition, expenditure, pleasure,—each and all of these spheres and departments of action, must be elevated, and more wisely governed than they have been—than they are. We hope, we trust in this improvement. We hope, as we hope in God. Let us press forward. Let us be encouraged and cheered, and borne onward, with lofty expectations. We do not know, we cannot conceive, what a glorious and happy country this may be a century hence, if we, and if coming generations, are faithful to it.

We have considered the general position, that a state of freedom, to be safe, must be a state of duty. It is a moral

situation, so to speak; and this, we think, is the light in which the people of this country should be most frequently led to contemplate it. In other words, though they may seem paradoxical, freedom should be felt to be the strongest bond of moral obligation; freedom from the interference of others requires the greater care of ourselves; freedom from tyrannical coercion must be accompanied by a willing subjection to reason and conscience; freedom from man should be devotedness and duty to God; freedom, in fine, must be self-restraint, sobriety, moderation, temperance, virtue, or its advantages and privileges will be but an imagination and a name. And there is the more occasion to say all this, though it may seem to be very simple and obvious, because there has as yet been so little real liberty in the world, that men have not learnt rightly to use it; it is so rare a boon, that they are more apt to exult in its mere possession, than to reflect on it as a care and a trust; it has been so wrongfully withheld from multitudes, that they are liable, in obtaining it, to grasp it with violence, and to wrest it into extravagance and licentiousness. We might speak of the illustration, which this remark has received from the history of Spain and Portugal, and the Republics of South America. We might speak, and we may say something before we close, of the illustration which the same remark is but too likely to receive in the great struggle for popular rights on which the whole civilized world is now entering. But it is meet, it is a part of that duty which we are endeavouring to inculcate, that we first look to ourselves. The visible contest for freedom has long since been brought to a triumphant termination; but the moral conflict is yet far enough from being ended, and it is a conflict on which every thing depends, as truly as it once depended on physical force, or manly courage. The battle has been fought on our plains and upon our high places; it is now again to be fought in society and by our very fire-sides.

Let us then consider the morality of our political situation in some of its great leading features and conditions.

There *is* a morality of our political situation. This, indeed, is the point which we have been endeavouring to state, in the general views which we have taken of the nature of free institutions. But we must venture in surveying more particularly the relations of freemen to one another, and to the whole body,

to insist upon a strict application to them of the principles of Christian morality; an application very much more strict, if we mistake not, than is usually applied to them. For the fact is undeniable, that vaguely and imperfectly as the principles of Christian morality are brought to bear as yet upon private life, their application to public and political conduct is still more loose and indulgent. Actions and principles of action, which would be thought intolerable in the ordinary relations of society, are admitted to a fair and honorable place, upon the theatre of political employments and party strifes.

Now we know nothing of two codes of morality, and we believe that Heaven knows nothing of them. And humble as our aim may be, and little as it may avail, yet for the sake of our own rectitude of judgment, we must appeal to the one standard. And the first act of the freeman, which we would bring to this standard, is that which most distinctly denominates him as such — the act of suffrage. There are few things that men do with a weaker sense of moral obligation, or with a more entire absence of it, than the casting of their vote at an election. If, indeed, the offer were made to buy their suffrage, they would spurn it with indignation; and yet they may as really sell their vote to a party, or to private interest, or to personal enmity, as if they sold it for a golden bribe.

The act of suffrage, to possess any dignity or value, must be performed as a grave duty. If, in our sober judgment, one candidate for office is better fitted for it than another, we are bound to vote for him without fear or favor, without passion or prejudice. We know, indeed, that this rule, strict as it may be thought, leaves room enough for mistake; for even in their sober judgment, men may judge very erroneously. And we say, therefore, still further, that every elector is bound to use his honest endeavours to free his mind from all undue biases. He owes this duty to his country; he owes it to his own interests. When he contributes to elevate an individual to the councils of the nation, he is helping to place there a power which is to be felt over a boundless extent of territory, and among twelve millions of people. Of such vast magnitude and peculiar sacredness is the trust which is committed to him; and he has no more right to disregard such interests, or to deal

recklessly with them, than he has to sow the seeds of pestilence in the heart of a mighty city. He ought to feel, that he is acting, not for himself alone, but for millions; the welfare of the whole vast people should be before him; their imaginary presence should surround the spot where he gives his suffrage; and their call upon his fidelity and disinterestedness should banish from his mind every low, partial, and selfish aim. There is a law that requires us to 'love one another,' and to labor for the common weal. Is that law abrogated during the period of an election? Is a Saturnalian license in morals proclaimed for that period, and are we permitted to slander private character, and to sport with public interests, and to set at nought all the principles of order, justice, and self-respect? Are we, in short, permitted to forget that we are Christians in the zeal we indulge as partisans?

Yet, if we were *not* bound to act as Christians, if we were at liberty to adopt the most selfish principles in politics, even then we might be justly required to act with sobriety, moderation, and candor. Even then the blind and insane zeal, too often seen in party warfare, would be unworthy of us. A few leaders may find it for their interest to hoodwink the people, and to drive them hard, in the career that is to carry themselves into office. But what interest of the people is it, to be harnessed to the car, and to be lashed onward in the course; to be chafed and wearied for a while, and then to be turned out like useless cattle, when their task is done? Let every man consult his own self-respect and his own interest, and we believe there would be far more wisdom exhibited in our elections, than is now usually seen in them. Would any one of us choose a mercantile agent who was incapable, or unprincipled, because he held certain views of trade in common with us? Why, then, shall we commit the most weighty trusts to political associates, if they are destitute of ability or worth? We must think, in our simplicity, that to choose none but good and able men would be a very safe proceeding. We are, the most of us, unqualified to form any very valuable opinion on difficult questions in the administration of the government. But we can form an opinion of the characters of men in our own districts, who may stand forth as candidates for office. And if we were to elect 'good men and true'; if we were to elect the wisest and best

men, without exacting from them any pledges, every considerate man, it seems to us, must feel more confidence in their course, than he could in the measures of mere partisans; must feel more confidence in a legislature so formed, than he could in an assembly where every question was to be influenced by party considerations, that is, by considerations extrinsic to the question itself.

If any of our readers think we are in Utopia, we must take leave to stay there a little longer. We hear much of parties, and of the various principles on which they are founded. We have heard of a 'Christian party in politics'; though the title is as deceptive as that of 'Holy Alliance' in the old world. But we wish with all our hearts, that there were indeed a *Christian party* in politics formed among us; that is, a thinking, liberal, and conscientious party. We believe that there are materials for it. We are mistaken, if many superior minds in this country are not disgusted with the low tricks and cabals, and the degrading and ungenerous prejudices, that belong to most political associations. We suspect that some who stand high in their respective parties, are but cold partisans after all. We trust that there is a vast fund of good sense among the people, if it were properly appealed to; and the establishment even of one newspaper in this country, with an able editor, who should fairly present both sides of every political question, and make it his constant business to disabuse the people of the thousand errors which the spirit of party is propagating through the land,—an undertaking like this, we say, could not fail, as we persuade ourselves, to have some effect on public opinion. And if but a small party could be formed of the impartial and candid, who threw off all other shackles, and felt themselves pledged to nothing but the truth, it might answer the purpose at least of a balance-wheel, to control the irregularities, and moderate the violence of the machinery of government.

The next step we have to take after having contributed by the act of suffrage to the legislation of the country, is the administration of its laws in our courts of justice.

Some questions concerning this department of our civil duties will indicate our own apprehension of the defects of Christian morality to which it is exposed; and they are all that we, at the present, have space for.

Is the obligation of an oath sufficiently regarded? We have been shocked to hear from those who are familiar with our courts of justice, that perjury, — not the perjury, which as such is liable to indictment, — but perjury by construction, perjury in an intentional concealment or coloring of the truth, is by no means so uncommon as to excite surprise.

Again; does fairness in argument hold a sufficiently high place, and have a sufficiently strict interpretation among the forensic virtues? We see no moral barrier against arguing both sides of a question, though only one side can be right. There are two sides to every question, and it is meet that both should be considered in the inquiries of the judge and of the juror. We should feel, therefore, that although a cause were palpably wrong, there would be no violation of moral principle in fairly stating it. It is but doing what the judge or the juror ought to do for himself. But still this is a duty which requires, for its right performance, the supervision of a jealous and vigilant conscience. If the advocate declares, that he solemnly believes that to be just, which he knows to be unjust, or if he urges an unjust claim, knowing it to be unjust, *as though* he fully confided in its rectitude, no Christian or righteous law can exonerate him from the charge of a serious moral dereliction. Words are words, they have their meaning and force, they are amenable to the obligations of truth and sincerity, as much in a court of justice as out of it. There are not two rules to walk by; but the rule is one, eternal, and immutable. It is true, that in many cases, justice consists very much in a balance of opposing claims, and there is much to be said, and earnestly said, on both sides. But where there can be no compromise, where a palpably unrighteous claim is set up, unhappy is his conscience who can speak as heartily for what he knows to be the wrong, as for what he knows to be the right, and can speak with the greater air of sincerity and earnestness, the worse he knows his case to be! Or, unfortunate is his mind, to whom every cause *becomes* right, which he undertakes to advocate; for his mind, on this supposition, must have become extremely mechanical, or utterly perverse, and must have forsaken the broad range of wholesome inquiry into the noble and generous principles of legal science, for the narrow and crooked by-paths of selfish and artful litigation.

We are ready to hear remonstrance against the views now

stated; and we should expect it to be in terms like these;—'Nay, but something must be conceded to human infirmity. If a man takes up one side of a question to defend, he is very apt to see only what makes for that side, and he is liable to urge insufficient arguments, and to support a bad cause with an air of sincerity and confidence.' We are willing to concede *much* to human infirmity, but not one iota of principle. And we think it most seriously behoves those who would keep a conscience void of offence in the profession of which we are speaking — that it most seriously behoves those who would make their daily studies and avocations minister to their intellectual and moral improvement, carefully to weigh the circumstances that have so much to do with their rectitude both of mind and heart. The pursuits to which we devote our whole lives should be paths,—we deem it not too serious to say,—paths that lead to heaven. It is certain, that no other will lead us there!

Once more; we ask if moral turpitude is properly treated in our courts of justice? In civil causes, are not duplicity and unfairness oftentimes so much a matter of course, that the most serious deviations from principle are looked upon with indifference or levity? In criminal prosecutions, too, are not the feelings with which crime is generally regarded, we had almost said, at the farthest possible remove from the spirit of Christianity? The unhappy man charged with a criminal offence — unhappy, if not guilty, most unhappy if he is so — is brought to the bar for trial. How is his appearance received, and how is the prosecution conducted? Is it in the spirit of Christian men, engaged in the sad task of investigating the offences of an erring and unhappy fellow-being? Is even that humane principle of the law regarded, that the accused man be held innocent, till he is proved to be guilty? Does the lowering brow of the spectators, or the proud and scornful glance of the eye, or the mocking gibe and jest that passes around, show any consideration, any pity, any humanity? Does the office of the prosecutor assume its highest dignity, or its most impressive character, when he testifies more satisfaction than displeasure, more of eager delight than of grave indignation or sorrow, as he traces the successive steps in that dark and mournful career of iniquity, that is fast bringing his victim to ignominy and

sorrow? We admit that there are difficulties in the Christian discharge of this office; that there is a strong temptation to let professional zeal go too far. But it is a temptation, like all others, to be guarded against. And, in our view, it is important, that it should be guarded against, in order to the most salutary and effective administration of justice. For it is evident, that all the effect that is produced upon the *mind* of the offender, is to exasperate, not to reform him, to render him more hostile than ever to society, and, in short, to make him, after his trial and his punishment are over, tenfold a worse man, and a more dangerous member of the community than he was before. The spirit of prison discipline is fast improving; that of our courts ought to keep pace with it.

But we propose now, in the third place, to pass from these slight notices of the duties and functions of freemen, to consider that grand condition which lies at the foundation of a free government;—we mean, the equality of its citizens. This has been long enough our boast; let us consider its difficulties and dangers? Our remarks on this head will be excursive, though they must necessarily be brief.

The condition of equality, to be healthful and happy, to be stable and well-ordered, must be a state of higher duty, of more mutual forbearance, of more Christian consideration and kindness, than any other political situation whatever. It has been often said, and it is unquestionably true, that the theory of Christianity is essentially republican. But it is equally true, that the practice, under republican institutions, must be essentially Christian, that the spirit of society must be Christian, or those institutions can never be permanent nor useful. That level, to which every thing is tending among us, which the distribution of property and the rotation of office are as certain to preserve, as the law of gravitation is to preserve the even surface of the ocean,—that level must not be like the low and marshy ground where floods sometimes sweep, and rank vegetation at other times springs up, and stagnant exhalations arise; but it must be rather like the broad and lofty table-land, which is sometimes found upon the tops of the mountains. We repeat, and would insist, with what emphasis we can give to language, that equality, such as exists among us, must be a state of great moral improvement, of high and holy duty, or it is not a safe, it is not even a desirable state.

We entertain a strong persuasion that the mass of the people in this country have by no means yet come to understand this moral necessity, which presses, as an unchangeable bond, upon their favored condition. We know that there is a general and vague conviction, that virtue is necessary to sustain institutions like ours. But it is not virtue in general that will suffice; still less is it negative virtue,— the absence of intemperance, dissoluteness, and disorderly manners. There are positive and specific virtues required to make our condition a happy one. Neither is the just idea of this happy condition to be satisfied by general prosperity. The revenue, the census, the statistics of the country may all tell us of prosperity. Business, among a people whose enterprise is unrestricted, may show great results. But if we would understand the real state of things among us, we must go beneath these general and gratifying representations, to the relationships of individuals, the interior condition of families, and the personal feelings that arise from the vaunted equality in which our civil institutions place us.

Look, for instance, at the relations of employer and employed, of householders and domestics, among us. We must be permitted to doubt whether these relations are yet as happy in this country, as they are among the more unequal and despotic institutions of the old world. We have no predilection, it is scarcely necessary to say, for distinct orders in society. Be it pride, or passion, or philosophy, that makes them so, they are, at any rate, to our republican tastes, altogether intolerable. We have too much respect for human nature, to survey these arbitrary distinctions with any patience, even at a distance. We abhor the tone and style in which superiors are allowed to speak to inferiors in such a state of society, or in which the low are obliged to address the high and privileged. We think it a totally false condition for human nature to be placed in, a condition at war with the spirit of Christianity, and entirely adverse, so far as it goes, to the formation of that character which becomes rational and immortal beings.

All this we hold to be true; and yet it is equally true, that the degree of moral cultivation among a people may be such, as to make distinct orders in society more favorable to happiness than universal equality. In that case, much is fixed, that may be safest in being so fixed; there are barriers which

are not to be broken over; the collisions of mind with mind, and passion with passion, are, in many respects, curtailed and limited. Rights, by such a constitution of things, are fewer, and claims are fewer, and differences and disputes, jealousies and heart-burnings, are, in that proportion, lessened.

Now, it is perfectly obvious, that if the members of such a community were placed at once on a footing of equality, they would require, in order to their mutual good understanding, their tranquillity of mind and social happiness, an increase of virtue proportioned to the greatness of the change.

Such is our condition, and upon us is laid the same moral requisition. We must learn to live together as Christians, if we can,—with mutual respect, with mutual forbearance, with the desire, not to exact service, not to enforce homage, but to promote each other's welfare; or we cannot live happily together. Very selfishness must here put on an aspect widely different from what it would do among the nobles and serfs of Russia, or among the grandees and peasants of Spain, ay, or among the gentlemen and commoners of England. Stern command will not do here; abject obedience has no place; and, in their stead, must be gentleness, courtesy, true self-respect, true kindness, or society will be held together by no peaceful bond. May our favored condition be doubly blessed in the enforcement of the great Christian law of love; for, truly, in no other way can it be blessed at all above other conditions of civil society.

The effect of this state of equality upon property, especially in the interior of the country, is a topic of great moment, and of most important moral bearings. It is a mistake to suppose, as many do, that pecuniary embarrassment is chiefly felt in our cities and villages. It presses with twenty-fold greater weight upon the agricultural districts of the country. Some of the banks in our cities can show, in heaps of bonds and mortgages, melancholy proofs of this fact.

It is, indeed, a most extraordinary state of things. Here is a community, we are accustomed to say, free, flourishing, and prosperous, beyond example; there never was a country in which all men, from the highest to the lowest, from the richest to the poorest, could be more independent. And yet, if we were to travel over this same favored land, and were to inquire into its real condition; if, not satisfied with fine

landscapes, and flourishing fields, and goodly dwellings, and the appearance of well-clad citizens, we were to inquire into the state of property, and the degree of real independence and comfort that prevail, we should be astonished at the appalling amount and distressing burden of pecuniary obligation. We should find an almost incredible proportion of the community laboring under this load and pressure. Debt, universal debt, would meet us, wherever we turned our eyes. The farmer owes the trader; the mechanic owes for the raw material; the trader owes the importer. In many districts, the country traders will testify that a considerable proportion of the debts contracted for what are considered the necessaries of life, lie unpaid for two or three years, — yes, and they lie, in the shape of mortgages upon real estate. We have been in some of the most beautiful townships in New England, and have been amazed, on inquiry, to find that half of the farms in them were under mortgage!

Now there are several causes to be assigned, doubtless, for this extraordinary state of things; but one distinct and prominent cause unquestionably is to be found in that state of political equality which we are considering. It creates a large unproductive class, in the female members of innumerable families in the country. The daughters of our *substantial farmers* (as they are called) cannot go out to service; it would be a degradation, as they would deem it. Meanwhile the cheapness of the fabrics that are sent out from our manufactories, has susperseded the labors of the loom and the distaff. Spinning and knitting are obsolete toils. And out of four, five, six, or eight daughters, it is obvious that the labors of only one or two can contribute any thing to the support of the family. At the same time, this non-producing is by no means a non-consuming class,—as the bills of the merchant show, to say nothing of that grosser part of the account, which the granary and the cellar have to render.

It is perfectly evident that farmers, with moderate means, must go down under this burden. They do go down by thousands. And what is infinitely the most to be regretted, they go down in character as they go down in property. They lose heart and courage. The mortgage that lies heavily upon their estates, lies heavily, as an incubus, upon their minds. They often sink under it, to indolence, vice, and ruin.

We cannot allow that to any of our readers, however personally uninterested, this state of things ought to be indifferent; for it involves an untold amount of distress in the whole country. It presents the operation of our great republican principle in a light, that teaches us to regard it with more of sobriety, and less of exultation. There must be simplicity and moderation among our people, if they would preserve any personal independence. There must be a real independence of mind, that prefers industry, in any shape, to indolence, falsely styled genteel.

It is high time, also, to consider what can be done to prevent these evils. We shall take advantage of the rambling discussion into which we have fallen, to throw out one or two suggestions on this point.

And we conceive that the grand *desideratum*, — we are speaking now of the means of competent and independent support,— is to find proper and profitable employment for the whole body of the people. We suspect that the season of winter is, to the most of our farmers, a time of too much leisure, either for their morals or property. We confess ourselves very little qualified to judge, and we may get more credit for good intentions than for good sense; but we would ask, if the various branches of domestic manufacture might not be easily and wisely introduced, to fill up the leisure of winter, and turn it to account? Some of our agricultural townships have become rich and flourishing upon the manufacture of shoes. Why may not others, to a certain extent, follow the example?

But it is employment for the unproductive class, before referred to, that seems to us the chief remedy for the pecuniary embarrassments of the country. We do not deny that there may be some extravagance in the modes of living, in dress, &c. There is, doubtless, great extravagance in multitudes, if we compare their expenditure with their income. But we believe that the people might live as well and dress as well as they do, nay, and better than they do, if they were all properly occupied with well directed labors.

We would, therefore, most earnestly direct the public attention to those branches of domestic manufacture in which females can engage. A very large amount of the cloths which we receive from England, are spun and woven, not in the great manufacturing establishments, but in private fami-

lies. Many portions of our country furnish the most abundant and delightful facilities for the promotion of these domestic arts, — for such they were of old, and such they may be still. The innumerable springs that burst from our 'thousand hills,' and form perennial streams, might afford a sufficient water power, though not for large establishments, yet for the little machinery that is necessary.*

With the same view we look upon the manufacture of silk in this country, as an object of immense importance. It can be carried on almost entirely by female hands, and at home. There are thousands and millions of acres of land in the country, that will support the mulberry tree, and are scarcely fit for any thing else. If they were all covered with this growth, no very material effects need be feared in depressing the price of the manufactured article. A small depression below the present price, would enable silk, as an economical article of wearing apparel, to hold competition with our cheapest fabrics.

But we must return to more general views of the subject which has led us into these details. We have been saying,

* 'The country,' says a letter from England, — we may make some allowance for the writer's exaggerations, — 'the country in the neighbourhood of Leeds and Huddersfield is full of villages, and every cottage is a manufactory for spinning and weaving. The cloths are carried to market in their gray or white state, just as they come from the loom — for these little manufacturers have no conveniences for dyeing and finishing; but the main thing is done at a very cheap rate, without any capital of consequence invested, either in buildings or machinery, and therefore without the loss of interest. It is chiefly labor that is mixed with the wool, and not capital, and that labor is of their own household.

'Now this is precisely what I think may be done in any part and in every part of New England, with this immensely important advantage, that the abundance of cheap building materials, and the multitude of natural waterfalls, will enable the enterprising, at a very moderate expense, to card and spin, by machinery, on their own premises, with the aid of their own family labor. Nothing, in the ordinary course of things, can prevent the success of such an establishment, but an attempt on the part of the manufacturer to carry on a business beyond his means.

'That the profits of the small manufacturer are reduced by a competition with capital and machinery, is no doubt true. But it is a singular fact, that after the wool is carded and *stubbed*, which is spinning, if coarse and lax, in threads nearly the size of one's finger, in large mills, still it can then be put out to families, to be spun fine by *hand jennies*, cheaper than it can be done in large mills.'

that the condition of civil equality has been one of the causes of pecuniary embarrassment in the country. There are wider views of the subject, that must occupy our attention a moment, before we close.

The principle of equality, the claim which men are putting forward to be respected as men, threatens to assume dangerous forms, in the creation of parties among us. If ever the wealthy and powerful shall, by proud assumption, or unrighteous oppression, array the mass of the people against them, they will be answerable for that anarchy, which may sweep every thing before it, and their own prosperity and pretensions with the rest. If ever the numerical strength of the country, without that apology, ay, or with it, rise and combine against property and talent, to level them in the dust, they will have the poor consolation of reflecting that they have destroyed the only system that gives them any liberty, or makes them of any account. We have, however, only to ask of any Middling-interest, or Working-men's party, that they will respect the true principle of equality, that they will respect themselves as men; and we shall feel that from this quarter all is safe.

For the safe operation of this great principle of Republicanism, we are bound to be the more anxious, because it is the principle that is now going forth to do its work among the nations; and every people looks to us, to keep bright and clear the beacon-light, by which they are guided.

It is impossible not to hope every thing, and we had almost said, to fear every thing, from that contest for human rights among the nations of Europe, which has for some time been as evidently approaching, as it is now evidently begun. Men are demanding to be respected as men. Who does not feel that they must at length succeed? — that the strongest claim of human nature must prevail, if it once arise in its true character and its sovereign majesty? But when this great claim is no longer the meditation of philosophers alone, when it is no longer a fair and beautiful theory, but has become a feeling, and a universal feeling; when human nature is awaking with indignant might, from long ages of oppression; when entire nations are stirred throughout by the spirit of Revolution, and the popular impulse heaves from its whole ocean-bed, it is impossible not to look with trembling to the issue. We fearfully ask, and the fear is not a vague one, will there

be enough courage and wisdom and sobriety and moderation, successfully to work out the great reform? Or, according to the prediction of one of our own Sages, must the civilized world wade through oceans of blood to a state of freedom and happiness?

In this great contest, far as we are from it, much is to depend on us. Let it not be said with boasting, but in all humility and fear and trembling. The spectacle of disorder, disunion, and failure among us, will dishearten the friends, and embolden the foes of liberty, all over the world. It will be a dark cloud in the West, that will spread blackness and fear upon the paths of coming generations.

Let it be said, then, and let it be repeated, that this united Republic owes to itself, and to the world, a mighty duty. Every member of this vast and favored community is bound to consider it, and to act upon that deep and sober consideration. The world has hitherto been working out its way to virtue and happiness, under the weight of burdensome and oppressive institutions. The great relations of government and society, indeed, have been improving since the feudal age; in Germany, in France, and in England, they have made considerable advances; but in this country, they have a free course; and here, to adopt the language of Scripture, prophetic of moral progress, here, if any where on earth, they must 'be glorified.' The hope of the world's improvement, the noblest and most sublime of all hopes, that are limited to this world, associated with philanthropy and with piety, with the love of human kind and the loftiest contemplations of Providence, — that hope must, if any where, have its fulfilment here.

This is no vague declamation. It is in the homes of human affection; it is in human hearts overshadowed and darkened till now; it is in the souls of men, degraded and borne down by ecclesiastical, by political, and social error and folly; it is in the children of our bosoms, and in our children's children, that we wish to see this blessed improvement.

We say, then, and repeat, that this country, where a new theatre is opened by Heaven for human improvement, owes to the world, to humanity, to suffering and sorrowing human nature, a solemn and stupendous duty; — a duty, vast as its empire, its spreading population, and its yet unproved resources. It owes that duty to the thousands who have sighed

for so happy a condition, and so noble an opportunity; owes it to the sages of old philosophy, to the suffering apostles of religion, to the martyrs of liberty; owes it to the Ciceros and the Senecas, to the Hampdens and the Sidneys, to the noble spirits all over the world, that, struggling against oppression, have fallen in sacrifice on the very altars which their virtues had builded! And if we fail of this duty, if we are unfaithful to this great trust, if we prove recreant and false to the great behest that is laid upon us, the blood of the scaffold and the stake will make inquisition for the tremendous default; the groans of a thousand battle-fields will rise against us; the sorrows of an hundred generations will reproach the base desertion of our trust; — our memory will live in the accusing voice of all coming ages, our epitaph will be the lamentation of the world!

Art. V. — *The Biblical Repository. No. I. January.* 1831. Conducted by Edward Robinson, Professor Extraordinary in the Theological Seminary at Andover. 8vo. pp. 198.

The editor tells us in his introduction, that the work is 'designed to promote a spirit of ardent and judicious inquiry in the wide field of Biblical literature.' To judge from this first Number, it is the German part of the field to which he means to conduct our steps, and evidently by a most orthodox path. The German Theology, it seems, is to be used, as far as it can in any way be reconciled with the peculiar views of the Andover theologians. But we must be content with the path for the sake of the prospect; and no doubt much useful information will be afforded by this journal, conducted, as it is, by one so well qualified for the undertaking.

The article on the Universities and Literary Men of Germany, with which the work commences, is very valuable for the judicious view it takes of the literary life of German scholars, and the accuracy of its statistical details. It would be difficult to find a more complete and correct account of the arrangement and government of the universities, of the

libraries, the habits of the students, and the names and characters of the professors. The whole is exceedingly clear, and seems successfully to combine and harmonize the various extravagant features, which other accounts have set in such bold relief. In the details we notice but one error, which regards the number of the Prussian universities. According to the Biblical Repository, there are but six, whilst the *Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, for February, 1829, gives seven.

The other articles are on the Interpretation of Psalm XVI; on the Principles of Interpretation; on the Grammatical Accuracy of the New Testament; and on Italian Theological Literature. The principles of Interpretation laid down in these various articles are certainly just, although not new to any one at all conversant with the subject. To those who are not, they are well deserving of notice. Such principles, as that 'the right interpretation is one, which deduces from the Holy Scriptures the very sense which the writers of them intended to convey,' and the rejection of the double sense in the prophecies, will very readily be admitted by all, we suppose; though certainly they will lead different minds to very different conclusions. Nor should we be inclined to differ from Professor Stuart in thinking (p. 148) that 'men inspired are so far from being divested of rationality, and understanding, and free agency, that they possess all these in a higher degree than ever.' The truth is, that these are principles, which the orthodox of Germany have adopted in common with their contemporaries. And this is the great benefit we expect from the publication before us, — that we shall have here the results, which the inquiring and active spirit of the liberal German theologians have produced on their more orthodox brethren.

The article on Italian theological literature is valuable as throwing some light on a subject, of which so little is known. On page 179 we read, that 'a theologian of learning, who undertook some years ago to demonstrate in a speculative manner, that the doctrine of the Trinity is consonant with reason, was suspected of a disordered intellect'; a proof of good sense, which we should hardly have expected from the church of Rome.

The literary notices are necessarily imperfect, nor do they pretend to be complete. We observe, that the expected

Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Professor Bleek of Bonn, is passed over rather lightly, with a reference to Professor Stuart's Commentary on the same Epistle. It might not be well to recommend Professor Bleek's Commentary too highly, since the Introduction, which is published, contains a most able and satisfactory proof, that St. Paul could not have been the author of the epistle; a truth, we believe, which nobody but Professor Stuart thinks of doubting.

We cannot close this notice, however, without some mention of the illiberal and incorrect account of the German Rationalists, in the article on Interpretation, translated from the German of Professor Hahn of Leipsic. It is time that the true character of German Rationalists should be better understood amongst us. What we have to expect in this matter from those who have the care of the Biblical Repository, is evident from their bringing forward Professor Hahn as their principal witness. This gentleman is known chiefly from his rash and violent public attacks on the Rationalists, and is called in Germany, from allusion to his name (Hahn, German for *cock*), the 'fighting cock' of Orthodoxy. On removing to Leipsic, he took occasion to challenge the whole University to a dispute touching this controversy. Professor Hahn calls himself* an '*evangelical* theologian;' and though he does not seem to go all the way with his party, it is necessary, in the outset, to explain what is meant by this name.

It is well known, that in Germany the Protestant church is properly called 'Evangelical,' in contradistinction to the Catholic church. But of late years a certain party has assumed to itself this name, of whom the following description is taken from the *Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, for June, 1830, page 278.

'This party distinguishes itself as the only faithful, the true evangelical church; beyond its own circle, the church is laid waste; its servants are priests of Baal. They insist upon the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures; on adherence to the various confessions of faith; and on unity of opinion in the church. They surpass Flacius† in their extravagant notions

* See Allgem. Lit. Zeitung, for June, 1829.

† Flacius maintained, that 'original sin is the very substance of human nature.' See Mosheim, Vol. IV. p. 334.

of the depravity of human nature, and hold Schwenkfeldt's theory of the "inner" or "internal word." * Add to this the rejection of all cheerful views of life, and even of the most refined and cultivated enjoyments. The watchword of the party, however, is a glowing hatred and an unwearied persecution of Rationalism. They look upon it as Infidelity, and as an attempt to undermine the church, and overthrow all true faith.'

This sketch of the evangelical party is no doubt somewhat exaggerated, or applies only to the most violent amongst them; but it is necessary to bear in mind, that there is such a party, whilst reading what the 'evangelical men,' so called, say of Rationalism.

Now it is plain, that from one of this party, even if he be not one of the most violent, we can hardly look for a fair account of Rationalism. And we are sorry, therefore, to see, that the editor of the Biblical Repository gives us so much of Professor Hahn's effusions, and promises more. It is not fair treatment of the public, to allow such representations of the present state of German theology to come before it, without comment or correction. We propose, therefore, to show, as shortly as may be, the unfairness of the view of Rationalism given in the article on Interpretation from the German of Professor Hahn; contenting ourselves, for the present, with a few counter-statements from the writings of German theologians.

We complain that Professor Hahn misrepresents the opinions of those who are commonly known as Rationalists; and that he takes far too narrow a view of the nature and origin of Rationalism.

On page 122 of the Biblical Repository, No. I, we find the following account of the Rationalists, taken, as it would appear, from Dr. Röhr's † 'Letters on Rationalism.'

'"The Scriptures are to the Rationalist nothing more than any other human book. He allows their authority, only where they coincide with his own convictions; and that not as the determining ground of those convictions, for these he regards

* See Mosheim, Vol. IV. p. 320.

† 'John Frederic Röhr, born 1777, is general-superintendent and first court-preacher at Weimar, and is regarded as one of the leaders of the Rationalists.' — *Biblical Repository*, p. 117. It may be added, that Dr. Röhr is one of the most celebrated preachers of Germany.

as true on their own grounds of reason; but simply as an illustration, that others also, wise men of former times, have thought and believed in the same manner. — The Rationalist considers the assumption of a direct and supernatural revelation as inadmissible and groundless. — He sees in the Scriptures nothing more than a human book, in which noble and wise men of former times have laid up, entirely in the ordinary manner, the results of their reflection and investigation upon the truths of religion.' "

Now Professor Hahn knows, and the editor of the Biblical Repository knows, and every body knows, that knows any thing about the matter, that this statement is incorrect; that the Scriptures *are* more than any other book to the Rationalist; and that he holds them to be the records of a divine instruction. The statement may be from the works of one of the teachers of Rationalism, but it is made up of passages taken out from their connexion, in order to convey a false notion of the author's opinions. This Professor Hahn knew so well, that he thinks it necessary to add on the next page, respecting the Rationalists, that to be sure, for some time past

They 'have proved more or less unfaithful to their fundamental maxim, that *human reason is the first and last principle of all true religion;* and have again recognised the principle of the evangelical church, viz. 1) That Christianity is really derived from an extraordinary divine revelation; and 2) That this revelation, presented to us in authentic sacred records, is the source of all our knowledge respecting our religion; and is such, by means of free investigation and interpretation.' — *Biblical Repository*, p. 123.

And then he gives in a note a passage from Dr. Röhr's later writings to this effect;

'Christian rationalism does not deny the fact of an extraordinary revelation from God in the Holy Scriptures, but only the irregular, that is, miraculous mode, in which it was effected; it does not, in respect to finding and pursuing the way to eternal bliss, refer man to his own reason, as the source of the highest ideas and truths, but only claims for him the right, and imposes on him the duty, of sifting and proving that which the Christian revelation makes known on the subject, by comparison with the religious ideas and principles of human reason; in order that in the concerns of his eternal salvation, he may show himself neither blind nor credulous.' — *Bibl. Rep.* p. 123.

Now Professor Hahn knew very well, that this last passage alone gives the true statement of the Rationalist views; and yet he puts it in a note as a kind of retractation and approach to what he calls the evangelical principle. That these are the views the Rationalists hold, and have always held, may readily be seen by referring to their other works.

Wegscheider* says,

'The Rationalists admit a divine revelation in Christianity as well as the Supernaturalists. The true distinction between them lies in their different views of the manner in which this revelation was made. The Supernaturalists believe in a supernatural and direct, or literally miraculous, divine influence, whilst the Rationalists admit only an indirect, providential,† divine influence. The consequence of the one system is, that reason must in all things bow to the authority of the Scriptures, as being the substance of a miraculous divine revelation; whilst the other system leads to the result, that *the Scriptures, as the records of a divine instruction*, which was conveyed in the usual course of Providence, are to be examined and proved by the aid of the moral principle, in order to distinguish what is divine in them. Consequently it is not the adoption, or rejection of the Scriptures, as the source of Christian knowledge, but their adoption or rejection in the light of a miraculous revelation, which marks the distinction of the two systems.' — *Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung for May*, 1829.

But the unfairness with which the Rationalists are treated by Professor Hahn, will best be exposed by the testimony of those, who are neither 'Rationalists' nor 'Evangelicals'; who cannot, therefore, be suspected of exaggeration on the one hand, nor of disguising the truth on the other.

Our first quotation for this purpose will be from Tzschirner's‡ 'Vorlesungen ueber die Christliche Glaubenslehre,' as reviewed in the *Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, for May, 1829. He gives the Rationalist view of the character of Jesus as follows;

'He, who was chosen by God for his great purposes, who represents the *Ideal* of a man without sin, *and came to reveal*

* Dr. Wegscheider, Professor of Theology at Halle, and the chief teacher of Rationalism.

† By *providential*, Dr. Wegscheider means, 'making a part of the great scheme of Providence.'

‡ Tzschirner was Professor of Theology at Leipsic, and not a professed Rationalist.

the divine will and counsels, may rightly be said to be the "Son of God" in a higher sense than other men, and to unite in himself the human nature with the divine. Therefore the Christian preacher may speak of Jesus, and it is his duty to speak of him as the Son and image of the Deity; and it need give him no anxiety if the idea of the actual, material combination of two natures should mingle with the spiritual adoration of Jesus. Thus the Rationalists substitute for the idea of a human Divinity, and the combination of the divine and human nature in Jesus, an ethical notion of the Son of God, and the revelation of divinity in the perfection of human nature.'

But the clearest and most complete account of Rationalism is given by Bretschneider,* in his 'Defence of the Modern Theology of Evangelical Germany,' a pamphlet written in answer to a certain Hugh James Rose of Oxford. He says,

'It is evident, on a very superficial acquaintance with German theology since the middle of the preceding century, that the inquiries into the nature and claims of Christianity have taken four very different directions. First, there were some, to whom all revelation was but superstition, — Jesus either a good-natured enthusiast, or an impostor, — and Christianity a mass of errors, which they thought it a duty to clear away. These were the followers of the freethinkers of France and England. They were very few in Germany, and amongst these few not one theologian. Here we may class Wünsch, author of the *Horus*, and the jurist Paalzow.

'A second class consists of those, who exalted natural religion at the expense of Christianity; who believed, indeed, that such a person as Christ had lived, but admitted no divine influence whatever in Christianity, and undertook to explain the life of Jesus and the origin of Christianity on this principle. Thus they made the life of Jesus a romance — Jesus himself a member of secret societies — and treated the Scriptures as mere human productions, which had come down to them by accident, and were not to be considered as the word of God. To this class belong K. F. Bahrdt (at first indeed a theologian, but afterwards removed from his place), and the layman Reimarus (author of the *Wolfenbüttel. Fragm.*), and Venturini. Perhaps, too, Brenneke.

---

* K. Gli. Bretschneider, Doctor of Theology, and General-superintendent at Gotha, author of the latest and best Lexicon of the New Testament, and of many other valuable works.

'A third, and very different class, consists of those who are commonly called Rationalists. They acknowledge in Christianity an institution of divine benevolence, meant for the salvation of mankind. They see in Jesus the messenger of divine Providence, *and believe that the true and unchangeable word of God is contained in the Scriptures*, to be there preserved and spread abroad amongst men. At the same time they deny any supernatural and direct divine interference in the establishment of Christianity, and suppose its end to be the introduction into the world of a religion suited to our reason. They distinguish, therefore, the essentials from the non-essentials in Christianity; that which is local and transient, from that which applies alike to all times and all places. To this class belong Steinbart, Kant, Krug, amongst philosophers; and amongst theologians, W. A. Teller, Loeffler, Thiess, Henke; and of the living, J. G. Schmidt, De Wette, Paulus, Wegscheider, Röhr.

'Lastly, there is a fourth class, who hold the Bible and the doctrines it teaches for revelation in a higher sense than the Rationalists. These admit a particular interference of the Deity for the establishment of Christianity; distinguish carefully the different periods of the divine instruction; found the truth of Christianity more on the internal evidence of its divine origin than on the miracles; particularly, however, distinguish between the formal articles of faith and the instructions of the Scriptures; and, as regards reason and revelation, maintain that it belongs to the former to examine and prove the latter, whilst this again must contain nothing, which is *contrary to* reason, though it may be *above* it. These opinions were held by Doederlein, Morus, Reinhard, Niemeyer; and are still held by Ammon, Schott, Bretschneider, and others.' — *Defence*, pp. 45 — 48.

Now it is to be observed, that these last also would probably be reckoned amongst the Rationalists by the true Orthodox, or Evangelical party. With them it is already heresy to question the verbal authority of the Holy Scriptures, or to distinguish between the articles of faith in the various Confessions of the Lutheran church. In this view, it would be impossible to define the limits of Rationalism. We think we are safe in saying, from some personal observation, that at least two thirds of the German theological students are Rationalists, — if a disposition to examine into the authority of the Scriptures, and a dislike to the 'Evangelical party,' so called, make them such.

It is evidently a matter of no small difficulty to understand the true character of Rationalism. If, indeed, by Rationalism nothing more be understood than the opinions of those who are Rationalists on system, the task would not be so difficult; though, as it would seem, even this proves no easy matter for some of the ultra-Evangelical party. But the truth is, that such a view of Rationalism is altogether too narrow. Another and more enlarged one has lately been given by Dr. Bretschneider in a letter addressed to a statesman on the question, 'Is it the duty of Evangelical governments to take any steps against Rationalism?'*

For the better understanding of the matter, it may be well to notice the circumstance which called forth this letter, though perhaps already known to many of our readers. Attempts have recently been made to induce the government of Prussia to displace certain Rationalist professors, who had become peculiarly obnoxious to their Orthodox brethren, no less from their popularity, than their opinions. It seems from Dr. Bretschneider's work, that application was made to him, as not a party concerned (Dr. Bretschneider being neither a Rationalist nor a subject of Prussia), for advice in this emergency, — a just compliment to his high character and great learning. He remonstrates strenuously against any interference on the part of the government in this matter, and in the course of his argument gives a view of Rationalism, which we never before have met with, and which will strike many as the only fair one. It is, that

'Rationalism is nothing more nor less than the necessary consequence of the intellectual and scientific developement of the times. It is the attempt to reconcile with theology the results of the progress, which the last few years have seen in all the departments of knowledge, and thus make it acceptable to those, whose minds are so constituted, that they cannot believe except on conviction.' — *Allg. Lit. Zeitung for June*, 1830, p. 307.

'In the advance of all the other sciences, the choice is left to the theologian, to overthrow the results which have been obtained, or to conform himself to them. The first is impossible. We have seen the futility of any such attempt in the

* 'Ob evangelische Regierungen gegen den Rationalismus einzuschreiten haben.' Leipzig. 1830.

resistance made by the Catholics to the system of Copernicus, which the Pope has at last been forced to admit. Nothing remains, then, but to adopt into theology the improvements in the other sciences, and thus restore peace between them; and this is the employment of the Rationalists of our times.' He concludes, therefore, that 'the contest against Rationalism, if the government should attempt it, would prove a serious, and, in many respects, most critical affair. It must be confessed (for it is the truth, and cannot be changed by denying it), that Rationalism is in its full strength; it is the prevailing sentiment in the educated part of the community; it is the result of the general advance of the sciences; it is an all-pervading excitement of the times, which the theologians cannot suppress, but are themselves more or less hurried along with it.' — 'If the state attempt to oppose it by prohibition, its endeavours will be fruitless, exciting only ill-will, opposition, and party spirit. If the state attempt to carry through the matter with a high hand, it will be betrayed into a contest, not with a few theologians, as some have represented, but with all the sciences — with the spirit of the age.' — 'The question is one of deep concernment, "What will be the result, if the government should enter into the persecution of the Rationalists?" A thousand examples show, that force has never effected any thing against conviction. The consequence of such interference has always been rather to call parties into life.' *

Dr. Bretschneider then goes on to notice the dangers that would be likely to follow the exclusive measures proposed, arraying, as they would, the uneducated against the educated, and bringing about, it may be, a schism in the church as complete and lasting as that which took place at the Protestant Reformation. We must not be held responsible for every view he presents, but we give them as the judgment of a dispassionate and unbiassed looker-on.

We think these quotations enough to show, that the article referred to gives an unfair view even of the opinions of the professed Rationalists; much more of the general character of Rationalism. It seems to us of importance, that this should be understood. If we are to echo the cry of the 'true evangelical' of Germany, we shall have to denounce

* As these extracts are from a manuscript translation of the 'Letter &c.,' which we have had the privilege of seeing, the page is not given. A notice of the original work may be found in the *Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, for June 1830, p. 307.

all free inquiry and liberal investigation as Infidelity and Atheism. There is already an unfounded and unjustifiable alarm amongst us about German theology. If not removed, it can only lead to mistake, and prevent the advance of truth. It is not well enough understood, that the systematic Rationalists — the regular, wholesale doubters amongst the Germans, are, and always have been, very few. A proper distinction is not made between the crude notions, which have been brought out in the course of unrestricted speculation, the ephemera of a day, and the opinions, which have really had weight with the learned, and rest on any thing like a firm foundation. This mistake, common to England and our own country, has been noticed by Bretschneider in his 'Defence of the Modern Theology of Germany,' above mentioned. He says;

'It is necessary to distinguish carefully amongst the various theological notions of modern times, with reference to the reception they have met with. First, there are notions and hypotheses which were made known only to be attacked on on all sides, controverted, and soon consigned to oblivion. Such were the opinions brought forward in the *Horus*, the notions of Bahrdt, Venturini, and the writer of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments, Eck's natural explanation of the miracles, and Brenneke's argument that Jesus lived twenty-seven years after his resurrection. Here are to be reckoned also various suppositions of Semler, particularly concerning the Scriptures and the writings of the church Fathers, which were at once rejected; as also his doubts concerning the authenticity of certain books of the New Testament, none of which have withstood the arguments brought against them, excepting those relating to the authenticity of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as ascribed to St. Paul, which was doubted and denied in the very first ages of the church.

'Another class consists of hypotheses and views, which were received with great applause for a time, but were always much opposed, and at length have been entirely given up, or are held only by a few. Here we count the moral interpretation of the Scriptures, the system of accommodation in its wider sense (for a certain kind of accommodation must be admitted on the testimony of the Apostle Paul himself), the natural explanation of the miracles, and the disbelief in positive future punishment.

'Then again there is a class of views, which are still held (though, comparatively, by a few), and therefore are constantly

assailed, and may be considered as still under examination. Here belongs the *strict systematic Rationalism*, as set forth in the writings of Röhr and Wegscheider.

'Lastly, there are the views, which have stood the test of time, and have been adopted by the greater part of the theologians. These are the views of such as distinguish between the doctrines of the church, and the doctrines of the Bible; and between the Bible, and the word of God therein contained; between the Old and the New Testament; particularly between things which have a general, and those which have an individual application; and between the truth, and the form in which it is conveyed. These constitute the fourth class of theologians above enumerated (see page 353). Their views are without doubt the prevalent ones, amongst the laity as well as the clergy, and are to be regarded as the result of the theological investigations of the last eighty years. The number of those, on the other hand, who hold strictly to the church system, or who, like Marheinecke and Schleiermacher, make a garb of the church system for their peculiar philosophical opinions, is much smaller, and is likely to remain so; whilst the number of the blind zealots for the articles of the symbolical books — the class amongst whom we find the accusers and denouncers of all reasonable theology — is fast diminishing, and will probably soon dwindle away to nothing. Now to take all these various opinions, the offspring of so many heads, and without regarding the different reception they have met with, to throw them together into one cauldron, and present the whole to the uninitiated as "German Theology," is to concoct a mixture worse than Shakspeare's witches ever brewed, — from which every good Christian must shrink with horror.' —*Defence*, pp. 49 – 54.*

* This notice of the First Number of the Biblical Repository has been delayed until after the appearance of the Second. No addition has been made to it, as the object of the writer was chiefly, whilst introducing the work to the readers of the Examiner, to qualify what he must consider the erroneous statements concerning the present state of theology in Germany.

ART. VI. — *A Harmony of the Gospels, on the Plan proposed by* LANT CARPENTER, LL. D. Boston. Gray & Bowen. 1831. pp. 276.

THE object of a Harmony of the Gospels is to show the agreement between the narratives of the Four Evangelists, by reducing them to chronological order, and arranging their corresponding portions in parallel columns. When the several Gospels are incorporated in one continued narrative, the work is called a *Diatessaron*, or *Monotessaron;* that is, *one* narrative formed *from four*. That the undertaking is attended with difficulty, and the successful execution of it considered important, is evident from the great number of works which have been published of this description. Our readers may be surprised to learn, that the number exceeded one hundred a century ago. In 1765, a select catalogue of them was published, containing one hundred and thirty; and, in the edition of Fabricius's Bibliotheca Græca of 1795, is an alphabetical list of one hundred and seventy-two. It may be fairly presumed, that, up to the present day, full two hundred Harmonies have been published.

The difficulty experienced in harmonizing the Gospels has arisen principally from a diversity in their arrangement of events, and from the want of dates numerous and precise enough to determine the time and order of occurrence. Hardly any thing purporting to be a narrative of real transactions could bear less resemblance than they do to methodical annals. Instead of full and complete accounts, they can properly be considered only as memoirs of our Saviour's life; — a circumstance, among others, favoring the opinion, that the Evangelists wrote for their contemporaries, and with but little anticipation of the wants of posterity. Nothing like an exact date can be found in Matthew, Mark, or John. We are told, 'that Jesus was born in the days of Herod the king,' and that he was crucified when Caiaphas was High Priest, and Pontius Pilate the Governor. The season of the year may be occasionally ascertained, by the nature of the occurrence, such as that of plucking the ears of corn, or by the mention of festivals; but the year itself is left undetermined. The commencement of the Baptist's ministry has been dated by Luke with remarkable precision; but, with

this exception, the foregoing remarks apply to his Gospel not less than to the others; and the commencement, the duration, and the close of our Saviour's ministry are left to be inferred, in the best manner we are able, from the number of events recorded, and the apparent lapse of time.

Nor are the facts and discourses recorded in the same order by the several Evangelists. In the facts, which are common to the first three Gospels, Mark and Luke have, in general, observed the same arrangement. Not having been eye-witnesses, and probably deriving their materials from a common source, they have placed them in an order, which they had no means of determining to be other than the true one. Mark's Gospel consists almost entirely of a narrative of facts. Luke has related a large number of our Saviour's discourses, several of which are not given by any of the other Evangelists; and, what is a remarkable feature in his Gospel, he has placed most of them together, between Chap. ix, 50, and xviii, 31, — which portion, comprising nine chapters, and some of unusual length, consists almost entirely of parables and discourses; and these are recorded as though all were delivered on our Saviour's last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. Matthew, who was a personal attendant upon Jesus, in making a different arrangement of his facts, would seem to have aimed at a chronological order, and, in distributing through his narrative the discourses he records, may be presumed to have connected them with the occasions, on which they were respectively delivered. The Gospel of John, which has but little matter in common with the others, appears from its contents to have been designed, as was long since asserted by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, to supply the omissions of the rest.

The difficulty of harmonizing the Four Gospels is still further increased by discrepancies between them in regard to the circumstances attending some events, or the time and place of their occurrence. Of these discrepancies advantage has been taken, both by the friends and the enemies of the Christian Revelation; by the former, to prove that the Evangelists were independent writers, and by the latter, to prove them unworthy of credit. It may be worth while to inquire, what is the just view of this subject. How great a difference may be allowed in the testimony of witnesses without impairing their credibility? Every difference is not

a contradiction. He, who relates a part, does not contradict him, who relates the whole. Thus, the account by Mark, that blind Bartimeus was restored to sight by our Saviour, as he went out of Jericho, is nowise contradictory to the account by Matthew, that two blind men were cured at the same time and place, and with the same attendant circumstances. The witness, who relates one set of circumstances attending an event, does not contradict him, who relates another. Thus, the account, by the first two Evangelists, of the manner, in which Peter and Andrew, James and John, were called to be followers of Jesus, is by no means inconsistent with the testimony of Luke respecting the preceding draught of fishes, which may have induced them so readily to accept the call.

Nor will real discrepancies in testimony, in regard to the circumstances attending an event, necessarily or naturally bring into discredit the event itself. Thus, if the accounts, which are given us by Luke and John, of the posture of the angels, who appeared to the women as they visited the sepulchre on the morning of the resurrection, be supposed inconsistent with each other, one of these accounts representing the angels to be *standing*, and the other *sitting*, and if the two Evangelists are speaking of the same appearance and the same point of time,* would the inference, even then, be justified, that there was no such extraordinary appearance? How much less, then, can such a discrepancy discredit the fact of the resurrection!

Nor does an inconsistency in regard to the place or time of an occurrence throw discredit upon the fact. When Mark relates, that the blind man was cured by our Saviour, 'as he *went out of* Jericho,' and Luke that the cure was effected, 'as he *was come nigh unto* Jericho,' will our inability to reconcile the discrepancy justify our rejection of their concurrent testimony, that such a miracle was performed? Or, if we are unable to reconcile the inconsistency between the testimony of the first two Evangelists, that our Saviour was anointed at Bethany *two days* before the crucifixion passover, and the express testimony of John, that this unction, with

* The Harmony upon Carpenter's plan represents the above accounts, as we think, rightly, to be those of *different appearances*; — that by Luke, of the appearance *to all the women at one time*; that by John, of the appearance *to Mary Magdalene alone at another.*

all its concomitants, took place *six days* before the passover, and the very day before the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, would the inference be rational, that no such transaction was performed? Conclusions are not thus drawn in regard to testimony respecting ordinary events. We require that historians should possess the best means of information, and use them with honest minds. If they were themselves eye-witnesses of the events they record, their authority is of the highest kind; if not, their authority is next in value, if they faithfully record the testimony they have procured by diligent inquiry from those who were. As the same occurrences, however, are viewed in various aspects, and produce different impressions on different witnesses; as the attention of one may be directed more particularly to one circumstance, and that of another to another; as memory is possessed by different individuals in various degrees of accuracy and retentiveness; and as events are recollected and connected according to different laws of association in different minds; we expect to find in all historians diversities in the manner of relation, — some things recorded by one which are omitted by another, — and some discrepancies between them in circumstantial concomitants, if not in important facts. Such discrepancies do nothing towards destroying our general confidence in the record. We know it to be morally impossible for two independent historians, writing after a considerable interval from the occurrence of the events, to give exactly the same relation, with no variation in their accounts of time, place, or circumstance. In ordinary cases such perfect coincidence would afford the strongest presumptive evidence of concert, if not of collusion, between them.

Do we meet with some such variations, and some such discrepancies, in the narratives of the Evangelists? — we ascribe them to the operation of the same natural causes.

What inference, then, is justified by the admission, that there are some discrepancies in these narratives, which cannot be reconciled? Not that the writers are unworthy of credit, but that they were not exempted, upon these points, from human fallibility. Nothing can be gained, in the evidence for the authenticity of the Scriptures, by forced argument, or exaggerated statement. Let the narratives of the Evangelists be considered as *actually the productions of those whose names they bear*, and the argument for their

credibility will be of the same nature, and equally conclusive, as for that of any records of unquestioned authenticity, either in ancient or modern times. It appears to us to derogate from the character and competency of the sacred historians, to suppose that they were not able to give an account of facts, without continued miraculous superintendence and suggestion. The supposition of such superintendence destroys all internal evidence of genuineness and authenticity. Such a supposition precludes all reply to those objections of the sceptic, which are drawn from the discrepancies in the accounts of the Evangelists. The above remarks are by no means intended to imply that the minds of the sacred writers were not divinely illuminated upon the great truths of the religion, but that, in giving an account of our Saviour's life, they were left to the exercise of their natural powers.

It is the fashion with some to speak in the strongest language of disparagement of the standing and capacity of the Apostles. The most extraordinary instance we have witnessed of this occurred in the discussion upon the evidences of Revealed Religion, which was held at Cincinnati, in the Spring of 1829, between Robert Owen, and Mr. Campbell, a clergyman of the western part of Virginia. With far more zeal than discretion, Mr. Campbell repeatedly spoke of the Apostles in the most disparaging manner. His expressions were noted at the time. He said the Apostles were '*stupid men*,' '*men of the lowest intellect*,' '*without a penny in their pocket*'; '*intellect was not wanted.*' We have stated his very words. Again and again, he applied to them the terms, '*roughness, uncouthness, and stupidity.*' By such means was the attempt made to support the claims of Christianity to a divine origin, for eight successive days, before an audience consisting of some thousands of people. How often have we reason to lament that the advocates of Revelation should furnish their adversaries with the weapons of attack! Had it been the fact that the Apostles were such low, ignorant, and stupid men, how easily might they have been duped by an artful deceiver! What can we imagine to be the object in thus disparaging the Apostles? It is, by making them the passive instruments in the hand of God, to ascribe to him immediately the glory of their success. The glory, on any supposition, must indeed be ascribed to God; but there is no ground in truth for the assertion, that the Apostles of Jesus

Christ were men of so low and degraded a *caste.* They were by no means possessed of inferior intellects, or any way deficient in intelligence. Most of them occupied, for any thing that appears to the contrary, respectable stations in society. One of them was an officer, — a collector of the customs under the government; and, however odious may have been the office, its duties must have required some capacity and intelligence. This was the Apostle, who, we are told, made for Jesus '*a great feast in his own house;* and there was a great company of publicans and of others, that sat down with them;' a circumstance not very consistent with the condition of abject poverty. Four of them were fishermen; but need not therefore be considered poor. They appear to have been owners of small vessels on the lake, and some of them had '*hired servants.*' Their occupation was doubtless respectable among the Jews, as much so, there is reason to presume, as that of trade or agriculture is with us. Something may be inferred in regard to the circumstances of these fishermen, from what is related by the Evangelists concerning the mother of James and John. She was one of a small number of women, who followed our Saviour from Galilee in his journeyings from place to place, and 'ministered unto him *of their substance;*' and she was one of those who bought spices to embalm his body. To the care of John, our Saviour, on the cross, committed his mother, 'and from that hour, that disciple took her unto *his own home.*' Of Peter and John it is said, indeed, in Acts iv. 13, that 'they were *unlearned and ignorant men.*' But the terms of the original, here so unhappily rendered, simply import, that they were neither doctors nor magistrates, but men in common stations of life, who had not been instructed in the schools of the Rabbies. Two of the other Apostles were own cousins of our Lord. If to these we add the great Apostle of the Gentiles, there was one, at least, who, in point of natural abilities, and, having been educated by the distinguished Rabbi, Gamaliel, in point of literary attainments, was probably not inferior to any Jew of the age in which he lived.

Such then having been the reputable standing and capacity of the Apostles, we believe they were qualified to relate what they saw and heard, in simple and unaffected narrative, like that of the Gospel history, without the necessity of a continued miraculous superintendence and suggestion.

We affirm, then, that we possess in the evangelical narratives, all that can be needed to establish their claims to credibility. They give us the testimony of competent witnesses. They were written by men sufficiently qualified for the undertaking, possessed of the necessary information, of honest minds, and actuated by every motive which could induce them to report the truth. The discrepancies between them, not in the relation of the main facts, but of some unimportant circumstantial concomitants, we believe, are to be accounted for, as they would be in the testimony of any other witnesses given after an interval of twenty or thirty years from the time at which the events occurred. Are they found on the part of the eye-witnesses? — they must be attributed to imperfect recollection. Are they found on the part of those who have recorded the testimony of others? — they must be attributed to imperfect information. Admitting the accuracy of these views, the work of harmonizing the Gospels is disencumbered of much of its difficulty. We believe it is owing to disparaging views of the capacities of the Evangelists, and the habit of regarding their writings as the works of men, the exercise of whose natural powers of memory and association was controlled by divine superintendence, that, in the numerous attempts to harmonize the Gospels, the success has in no way been proportionate to the effort. Instead of a patient induction of facts, and the adoption of a theory in conformity with the Gospels, the theory itself has been framed at the outset, and the Gospels then bent to its support. This will appear from a concise account of the manner in which some of the principal Harmonies have been constructed.

Tatian, a native of Assyria, and an ecclesiastical writer, who flourished about the year 172, is generally regarded as the first Harmonist. The work which has been transmitted to us under his name, considered by Lardner as genuine, though critics of the highest authority have doubted it, is not so properly a *Harmony*, as a *digest of the Gospel history*, or a narrative of the life of Christ, formed from the four Evangelists. The order of Matthew is generally observed, though with some exceptions apparently arbitrary.

The next work of the kind was a Diatessaron by Ammonius, an Alexandrian, in the beginning of the third century. He is said by some to have followed almost exactly the method of Tatian. This we must take upon trust, for his

work is not extant. It seems, however, to have been favorably regarded by Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, a century later, and not improbably to have suggested to him his ten celebrated canons, or rules, for harmonizing the Gospels.

This work of Eusebius, though often spoken of as a Harmony, cannot be called so with propriety. It consists of ten tables, for the separate distribution of those portions of the history of Christ, which are found in all four of the Gospels, — those which are common to three, — those which are contained in two only, — and those which are peculiar to each. A few other Harmonies were made in these early times, but they were of very little value.

In speaking of those which have appeared since the Reformation, we shall classify them according to the principles on which they have been constructed, in reference, first, to the chronological arrangement of the Gospels, and, secondly, to the duration of our Saviour's ministry.

I. In regard to chronological arrangement, Harmonies may be divided into two classes; those which have been formed on the supposition, that all the Evangelists have adhered to the true order of time, and those, of which the authors have admitted, that, in one or more of the Gospels, chronological order has been neglected.

1. Andrew Osiander, a German, one of the earliest disciples of Luther, and a fellow-laborer with him in the reformation, who published a Harmony in 1537, stands at the head of those, who have maintained, that all the Evangelists, in the arrangement of their facts, adhere strictly to chronological order. Several Harmonies have been constructed on this plan. Michaelis has justly remarked, that they 'render the Gospel history not only suspicious, but incredible.' For whatever facts or discourses have a different connexion in any two Gospels, though all the attendant circumstances are the same, are supposed by such harmonists to have occurred twice. Thus two sermons are supposed to have been delivered at the Mount, one related by Matthew (v, vi, vii), and the other by Luke (vi. 20 — 49); two centurion's servants are supposed to have been healed; twice the disciples are supposed to have plucked the corn on the sabbath, the same objections being made by the Pharisees, the same answer returned by Christ, and a withered hand cured immediately afterwards, on both occasions; two women are supposed

to have been cured under the same circumstances of an issue of blood, and two damsels to have been restored to life, the one miracle immediately following the other in both cases; — and two tempests to have been stilled in the same manner upon the sea, each followed by the cure of demoniacs at Gadara.

Dr. Macknight, the first edition of whose Harmony appeared in 1756, a second edition in 1763, and a third in 1804, has, throughout his great work, followed the plan of Osiander, with but three exceptions that he acknowledges, or we have noticed. He transposes the accounts of the walk through the corn, and the cure of the withered hand; of the cure of the bloody issue, and the restoration of the daughter of Jairus; of the stilling of the tempest, and the cure of the demoniacs; from the places they occupy in the Gospels of Mark and Luke, and arranges them according to the order of Matthew. We are at a loss, however, to discover the reason of his deviating in these few instances, and in these instances only, from the rule he had prescribed to himself, and which he endeavours at great length to defend. The above occurrences, as related severally by the first three Evangelists, are not more certainly the same, than the cure of the centurion's servant mentioned by Matthew (viii. 5 — 13.) is the same with that recorded by Luke (vii. 1 — 10); precisely the same address being made to Jesus in both cases. Yet Macknight supposes these to have been different miracles. Twice he supposes that our Saviour, after casting out a demon, refuted in the same manner the same calumny of the Pharisees, that he cast out demons by Beelzebub. Three times he supposes that Jesus was anointed by pious women; twice, with a great number of corresponding circumstances, in the week before his crucifixion. He maintains, that, at two different times, a person addressed our Saviour thus; 'Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest,' and Jesus made exactly the same reply, 'The foxes have holes,' &c. This alone might not, in itself, be very improbable; but the supposition becomes at once extravagant by adding, that immediately after, on both occasions, a disciple asked to be permitted to go and bury his father, and Jesus replied to both, in the very same words, 'Let the dead bury their dead.'

Macknight's work has had considerable reputation, and his

Paraphrase and Commentary imbody a great variety of valuable matter; but the principle, on which his Harmony is constructed, we are satisfied, is fundamentally wrong. We have no hesitation in admitting, that our Saviour may have occasionally repeated some discourses to different hearers, and performed similar miracles on different occasions; but that a great variety of circumstances, in the same order and of the same nature, and some remarkably peculiar, should have preceded and followed, on different occasions, exceeds the limit of our belief. This remark we will illustrate in the case of the unction of our Saviour a short time before his crucifixion. Matthew, Mark, and John have related the occurrence. The close circumstantial agreement between the accounts of the first two Evangelists, considered as the same, and that of John, may be stated thus. According to both, the unction was at Bethany; in the week before the crucifixion; not in the house of Lazarus, the friend of Jesus, as might have been expected, but in another; and was administered, not by his host, but by a woman; the ointment was valued, in both cases, at three hundred denarii; and seems not to have been recently purchased, but kept for some time, as Jesus expresses it, for his burial; the unction, in both cases, was censured by some of the disciples, the ground of censure was the same, and the same answer was returned by Christ; lastly, the unusual expression *νάρδος πιστικὴ, ointment of spikenard,* of the use of which not another instance occurs in the New Testament, nor a single instance in the Septuagint, is applied to the ointment in both these accounts. Now should an historian assert, that an event, attended with such a variety of circumstances, in the same order, and of the same nature, occurred twice in the same week, should we not be justified in questioning his veracity? Yet all the Harmonies constructed on the plan of Osiander suppose the Evangelists to assert this.

It would be doing no injustice to Whiston, perhaps, to class him with these Harmonists. He published his 'Short View of the Chronology of the Old Testament, and of the Harmony of the Four Evangelists,' in 1702. He maintains the same position, that all the Gospels are written in chronological order; but to relieve himself from the difficulty of supposing the same miracles to have been wrought, and the same discourses delivered, as many times as we find them

differently arranged in the several Gospels, he advanced the hypothesis, that the portion of Matthew's Gospel, which extends from the fourth to the fourteenth chapter, has been transposed from its original order by another hand. This he calls a '*new and strange proposition*,' and a '*paradox*.' It evinced boldness and ingenuity, and avoided many of the difficulties which pressed upon Osiander and his followers. Instead of supposing two sermons to have been delivered on the Mount, he places Matthew viii. 1, between v. 1 and 2, immediately before the commencement of the discourse, by which transposition it would be delivered, not *on* the Mount, but *below*, perhaps *on the plain*, according to Luke. So that the account would read thus, 'And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain; and, when he was set, his disciples came unto him. And when he was come down from the mountain great multitudes followed him. And he opened his mouth and taught them, saying,' &c. Whiston has, however, fearlessly maintained that our Saviour was anointed twice at Bethany, in the week before his crucifixion; and that he three times cast out the traders from the temple, twice but a few days before the last Passover.* A refutation of Whiston's 'new and strange proposition,' was published by Jeremiah Jones, the author of the learned work on the Canon of Scripture, in 1721, entitled 'A Vindication of the Former Part of St. Matthew's Gospel from Mr. Whiston's Charge of Dislocation.'

2. At the head of the other class of Harmonists, who have proceeded on the supposition, that, by one or more of the Evangelists, chronological order has been neglected, is generally placed Martin Chemnitz, a German Lutheran, of some eminence in his time, whose Harmony was first published in 1593, seven years after his death; again, with large additions by other hands, in 1628; and again, with a commentary on the Gospels, in 1704. He entirely rejected Osiander's leading principle, and takes the liberty to recede, occasionally, in the arrangement of his Harmony, from the order of all the first three Gospels. Chemnitz was followed, with but little exception, by all the Harmonists for half a century. Since which time, however, a great diversity of opinion has prevailed among the Harmonists of this class, respecting the

* See his Harmony, p. 130.

comparative accuracy of the several Evangelists, in observing the order of time, and which of them may be most safely followed in the arrangement of a Harmony. For a considerable period the order of Matthew was believed to be entitled to the preference, as had indeed been maintained by St. Augustine, in the year 400, by some Harmonists of the fourteenth, and by Ludolphus, a German monk, of the fifteenth century. The 'Life of Jesus Christ, formed from the Four Evangelists,' by this last mentioned author, was so highly esteemed, that it was translated into several languages, and is said to have passed through thirty editions. By these Harmonists the last three Gospels were so transposed as to conform to the order of Matthew. It may be interesting to the reader to be informed, that Sir Isaac Newton was of the same opinion in regard to the order of Matthew. 'He was an eye-witness,' says Newton, 'of what he relates, and so tells all things in due order of time, which Mark and Luke do not.' *

But a totally different hypothesis was advanced by Dr. John Richardson, whose Harmony of the Gospels was published in the second part of the Annals of Archbishop Usher, in 1654; viz. that 'Matthew is found only to have neglected the order of time, which is constantly observed by the other three, (if you will except the parenthesis of John's being cast into prison by Herod, Luke iii. 19, 20).' Of Richardson, Usher says, that he was a 'learned man, and much exercised in the studies of the Holy Scriptures.' † This hypothesis of Richardson has been followed by some Harmonists of the greatest name. It is sufficient to mention Le Clerc, Pilkington, and Newcome.

Le Clerc's Harmony, which appeared in 1699, has been regarded by critics as a work of much merit. The Gospels are printed in parallel columns, in Greek on one page, and in Latin on the other, with a history of Christ at the bottom, framed from the Four Evangelists, in the form of a Diatessaron. A dissertation on the chronology of our Saviour's life, and an exposition of the principles of the Harmony, are affixed. Le Clerc professes to have adopted the principle of

* Observations on Daniel, p. 152.

† Usher's Annals of the World, edition 1658, p. 819.

Richardson, and, in constructing his Harmony, in the main to have followed it out.* He supports the position by arguing, from the import of the word καθεξῆς, *in order*, in Luke i. 3, that it was the declared purpose of this Evangelist to observe the true order of time; and therefore that Matthew's arrangement must be so transposed as to conform.

It was doubtless to reconcile this main principle of Richardson with that of Osiander and his followers, that Whiston advanced his 'new and strange proposition,' in regard to a transposition, since it was written, of the former part of the Gospel of Matthew. Whiston speaks in high commendation of Bishop Richardson as a 'great man,' who had stated in his Harmony the true order of the Gospels much better than any one before, and to whom he had been principally obliged in the formation of his own.†

Richardson's main principle was adopted by Pilkington, who published his 'Evangelical History and Harmony,' or Monotessaron, in 1747. He says, in his Preface (p. xiii.), that Dr. Richardson 'seems happily to have first discovered the method that must be generally pursued, in order to reduce the several Evangelical accounts to a proper series.' Again, in his Notes (p. 15), he says, 'Candidly examining the point, it will, I doubt not, clearly appear to every reader, that it is in St. Matthew's Gospel, where the true chronological order of the history is neglected.' He supports his position, like Le Clerc, by the word καθεξῆς, in Luke i. 3. Pilkington's work possesses much merit; not so much on account of its arrangement, as its Chronological Dissertations and Notes.

Archbishop Newcome, also, in his Harmony, published in 1778, followed the plan of Richardson. He says, that 'all attempts to reconcile the Evangelists, as to the general series of their facts, will be in vain undertaken by those who consider St. Matthew as adhering to the strictness of historical order. This rock was long since pointed out by Bishop Richardson.'‡ Newcome does not follow St. Luke as the most exact of the Evangelists. He says, 'Chronological order is not precisely observed by any of the Evangelists;

* Dissertatio 2da, Canon I, p. 516.
† Whiston's Harmony, p. 386.
‡ Preface, p. iii. Andover edition.

St. John and St. Mark observe it most, and St. Matthew neglects it most.'* The text of the Harmony is disposed after the manner of Le Clerc. 'Le Clerc,' says he, 'has exhibited the text of the Evangelists in the most useful manner of any Harmonist whom I have seen. I have, therefore, adopted his method, though with much difference in the general and particular arrangement.' † Newcome's Harmony contains, at the bottom of the page, a selection of various readings from Wetstein; and at the end a large body of very valuable notes. The work was executed with great ability and candor, has received the sanction of the University of Oxford, and is deservedly ranked as superior to all others, which have been constructed on the plan of Richardson. It was very handsomely reprinted at Andover, Massachusetts, in 1814, in a more convenient form than the original folio, with all the author's notes, and with the text and select various readings of Griesbach. Professor White, of Oxford, published a small octavo Diatessaron, in 1799, founded on the Harmony of Newcome; with the exception of the part relating to the Resurrection, where he has followed West and Townson.

It must be evident, from the preceding account, that, in the Harmonies of this second class, there must be a great diversity in the general method and arrangement, some making one and some another Gospel the standard, to whose order the rest are so transposed as to conform.

Dr. Priestley should be here mentioned. He published two Harmonies, one in Greek, in 1777, the other in English, in 1780; both on the same plan, with the same mode of arrangement. Dr. Priestley has been accused of haste in the preparation of his works; but in regard to his Harmony, he says, at the beginning of his Preface, 'I can assure my readers that there is hardly any subject on which I have bestowed more *pains*, or to which I have given more *time*; and I never bestowed my labor or time with more satisfaction to myself.' The principle on which his Harmony is constructed, differs altogether from that of any which had appeared before. He proceeds on the supposition that none of the Evangelists has entirely followed, or entirely neglected, the true order of time. He has interwoven the distinct portions of the Gos-

* Preface, pp. iv, v.

† Ibid. p. x.

pels according to their several notations of time; though, in this, he will probably be thought to have been unduly influenced by his previously assumed hypothesis, respecting the number of passovers in our Saviour's ministry, to which we shall presently have occasion to advert. In Priestley's Harmony, that Gospel, which he considers as giving the most full and accurate account of any transaction, is printed in a larger character. He made his arrangement by means of the following mechanical contrivance; 'I procured,' says he, 'two printed copies of the Gospels, and having cancelled one side of every sheet, I cut out all the separate histories, &c. in each Gospel; and having a large table appropriated to that use, I placed all the corresponding parts opposite to each other, and in such an order as the comparison of them directed.' *

On the principle that all the Evangelists have neglected the order of time, few attempts have been made to harmonize the Gospels. We should be inclined to think it a hopeless attempt; for if no one of the Gospels can be regarded as a standard, we may transpose and arrange *ad libitum*, for there will be no criterion by which the actual succession of events can be determined. Upon this point opinions directly opposite have been maintained. Whiston, on the one hand, lays down the following as his first proposition, which he says ought to be a *postulatum*, that 'The four Gospels are not *occasional memoirs*, but *methodical annals* of the acts of Christ.' † And Macknight affirms, that 'each Evangelist has digested his own narration, as if nothing had been omitted by him.' ‡

Griesbach, on the contrary, whose name alone gives weight to his opinion, declares, in the Preface to his Synopsis of the Gospels, of which the second edition was published in 1797, that he 'very much doubts whether a Harmony can be composed from the memoirs of the Evangelists, sufficiently conformable to true chronological order, and framed upon sure grounds.' § This Synopsis of Griesbach, therefore, was not

* Preface, p. xvii.

† Whiston's Harmony, p. 97.

‡ Preliminary Observations, iii. p. 13.

§ 'Valde dubito, an ex Evangelistarum libellis harmonica componi possit narratio, veritati quoad chronologicam pericoparum dispositionem satis consentanea et firmis fundamentis superstructa.' — Præf. p. vi.

intended to exhibit a chronological arrangement of events, but to distribute, in a series of sections, in parallel columns, the matter which is common to the first three Gospels. What is peculiar to each Gospel is inserted in intermediate sections. Mark's order is generally observed. This work of Griesbach was more highly esteemed by Bishop Marsh than any Harmony extant.

On the question, Whose order deserves the preference? we have no hesitation in saying, that our opinion is in favor of Matthew's. Mark and Luke, we have been convinced by Bishop Marsh, derived their materials from some common source. This supposition only will explain the phenomenon, that there should have been such an exact agreement in the arrangement of the facts between two historians, neither of whom was an eye-witness. These two Gospels, therefore, resolve themselves into a single authority; and we have merely to choose between the testimony of an eye-witness, and that which is given us at second hand.

Many have supposed with Le Clerc, that Luke should be the guide to the Harmonist, as he has declared his intention to write '*in order*' (καθεξῆς). But, according to the ablest critics of the present day, the word may mean *methodically*, or, *in connected series*, as properly as *in the order of time*. In following the order of Matthew, we conceive that a Harmonist possesses advantages that can be derived from no other guide; and, if he can interweave with it the separate portions of John, without doing violence to his arrangement, then all that is desirable in a Gospel Harmony may be successfully attained.

II. The method of arrangement pursued by Harmonists has depended not only on the regard they have severally paid to the present order of the Gospels as a chronological order, but quite as much on their views respecting the duration of our Saviour's ministry, or the number of passovers which occurred between his baptism and death. It is plain, that a Harmony, which distributes the events of Christ's ministry over the space of three or four years, must differ widely from that, which comprises them all within the compass of one. It has been generally said that Tatian, the first Harmonist, included all within one year. This is, at least, doubtful. According to Dr. Lardner, Tatian computed three passovers, at the last of which Christ suffered. It is doubtful also

whether Origen, in the former part of the third century, supposed our Saviour's ministry to close at the second or third passover. His testimony upon this point is far from being clear. The opinion of Irenæus, in the second century, was very peculiar. He computed but three passovers in Christ's *ministry*, according to Lardner, yet supposed about twenty years to have elapsed between his baptism and death. In support of this opinion, he appealed to the observation of some Jews to our Saviour, John viii. 57, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?' Whence he inferred, that Christ was then actually not far from fifty.

Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, both at the end of the second century, with all or most others at this early period, confined Christ's ministry to one year, or, at most, a year and a few months. As far as we are able to judge, this is a fact pretty well established. Respecting the value of these authorities, there may be room for a difference of opinion. Eusebius, at the beginning of the fourth century, was the first who discovered four passovers in the Gospel of John. He thereupon advanced the opinion, that Christ's ministry extended through a period of about three years and a half. This opinion of Eusebius, though not admitted either by Epiphanius or Augustine, soon prevailed over all others; and has been generally received from that time to the present. Some Harmonists, indeed, have extended it to a longer period. Whiston and Pilkington thought the ministry included five passovers, and that one of them was celebrated before Christ was baptized. Sir Isaac Newton, who has given, in his 'Observations on Daniel,' * a summary view of the events in the ministry of Christ, entertained the same opinion, that there were five passovers between its commencement and its close. Macknight also has constructed his Harmony on the same supposition; though, in his 'Preliminary Observations,' † he evidently inclines to the belief, that the ministry of Christ may have included six passovers or even more.

On the opinion of Eusebius, however, most Harmonies have been constructed; and no serious attempt was made to shorten the period of Christ's ministry, till 1733, when Mr. Nicholas Mann revived the ancient opinion, that it was of but little more than one year's duration. In his Disserta-

* Pages 147—156. † Pages 10—12.

tions on the 'True Years of the Birth and Death of Christ,' he has supported this opinion with great ability; and has given the outlines of a Harmony constructed upon it. The work seems to have produced a great sensation at the time; and the conclusion it aimed to establish, was called a *strange hypothesis.*

The credit of reviving the ancient opinion is justly due perhaps to Dr. Bentley, who was led to it from his own examination of the Gospels, and who communicated it to Dr. Hare, and he again to his pupil, Mr. Mann.*

This hypothesis was embraced by Dr. Priestley, who published a view of it, with Mr. Mann's arguments, and some additional ones of his own, in its support, first in the Theological Repository, and afterwards, at greater length, in connexion with his Harmony, which he had constructed upon it. Shortly after appeared the Harmony of Newcome, formed on the common opinion, and containing the objections to the hypothesis of Mann, and to Dr. Priestley's arguments in its support. An able, and perfectly amicable controversy ensued between them, in which the subject was very thoroughly examined, and the arguments on both sides urged with ingenuity and force.

In endeavouring to determine the duration of our Saviour's ministry, an undue weight has been attached by some to arguments of an external nature. The most important of these have been founded upon Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks; upon the testimony of some ancient writers, that Christ was crucified during the consulship of the Gemini; upon the observation of some Jews to our Saviour, shortly after he had cleared the temple, that it had been forty-six years in building; and upon astronomical calculations to ascertain the year next after the fifteenth of Tiberius, when the passover, or fourteenth day of the first moon, would fall upon Friday. But these computations, depending upon facts, insufficient in number, and indeterminate in date, are so various and uncertain, that the arguments founded upon them are altogether unsatisfactory.

Mr. Mann, and Dr. Priestley after him, attached much importance to the testimony of the early Christian writers, in support of the opinion, that our Saviour preached but one

* Biograph. Britannica, 2d edit., *Art.* Bentley.

year. Sir Isaac Newton, however, rejects their testimony as of little value. 'Relating to these things,' says he, 'there is no tradition worth considering.'* It does not appear, that these early writers were possessed of any better evidence upon this subject than we are ourselves.

The following are the arguments most worthy of consideration in support of the opinion, that Christ's ministry was but little more than one year in its duration. Nothing in either of the first three Gospels implies that Christ preached more than one year. No mention is made in either of any public festival, or of any journey of our Saviour from Galilee to Jerusalem, between his baptism and the journey to the passover at his crucifixion. No mention of seasons of the year would imply a longer ministry. It is never said of an event, that it occurred in the first year, or in the second or third year, of Christ's ministry; nor are there any equivalent expressions, such as might be expected upon the common supposition. Had we no other Gospel, therefore, there would be no reason to suppose, that all the events recorded after the baptism of our Saviour were not comprised within a single year. Luke has dated, with remarkable precision, the commencement of the Baptist's ministry; and the course of his narrative leads us to infer, that the death of Christ could not have been later than the following year. Now it seems an improbable supposition, that Luke has left the date of this last event, by far the most important, so undetermined, that his reader is naturally led into an error of two years respecting it.

There were three national festivals, which every male Jew was required, by the law of Moses, to attend at Jerusalem; these were the Passover, which occurred toward the end of March; the Pentecost, fifty days after the Passover, or about the middle of May, and the Feast of Tabernacles, near the end of September.† Supposing, then, our Saviour's ministry to have commenced previous to a passover, and to have extended to three years beyond it, nine national festivals must have occurred in this interval; and Jesus, who must be presumed to have 'fulfilled all righteousness,' must have

* Observations on Daniel, page 146.

† The Feast of Dedication, which was celebrated in December, was not of divine institution; and attendance upon it was not obligatory.

made nine journeys to Jerusalem, before he went up to the crucifixion Passover, not one of which is recorded by either of the first three Evangelists. And even if we suppose, that, in addition to the festivals of one year, John has mentioned the Passover of another, still there will be five national festivals, and, it may be presumed, as many journeys also of our Saviour to Jerusalem to celebrate them, of which no notice is taken even by that Evangelist, who wrote to supply the omissions of the others.

The common opinion respecting the duration of the ministry of Christ involves the supposition, that he preached nearly or quite two years before the death of John the Baptist; according to Newcome, two years and a half; and that, during this time, the report of his miracles spread throughout all Galilee, Decapolis, Syria, Judea, and the region beyond Jordan. But according to the testimony of the first three Evangelists, it was not till after the death of the Baptist, that Herod and some others first heard of the fame of Jesus.*

But it is said, by the advocates of the common opinion, that John has mentioned three distinct Passovers, Chap. ii. 13; vi. 4; xi. 55; and, besides these, a festival, Chap. v. 1, which, if not proved to have been another Passover, yet appears, from the connexion in which it stands in reference to the other Gospels, from Christ's residence in Judea, from the number of disciples he made, and the extensive reputation he acquired, not to have occurred within a year after the first Passover. To this it is replied by Priestley, that all these transactions could be comprised within fifty days, and, therefore, that this feast, John v. 1, may have been the Pentecost, next succeeding the first Passover, and that nothing which occurred in connexion with it would imply a different season of the year.

But a great objection appears to lie against the opinion of the one year's duration of Christ's ministry, from the mention of a Passover in John vi. 4. To obviate the objection, drawn from this passage, which, if well founded, is fatal to the hypothesis, recourse has been had to the conjecture, that the word *passover*, in this verse, is an interpolation. In

* See Matthew xiv. 1, 2; xvi. 14. Mark vi. 14; viii. 28. Luke ix. 7, 19.

support of the conjecture, it is alleged, that the early Christian writers could not have entertained the opinion they generally did, that Christ preached but one year, if the word *passover* had existed in their copies of the Gospel of John. Even Irenæus, who professes to enumerate all the Passovers mentioned in the Gospels, to extend the ministry of our Saviour to as great a duration as possible, has taken no notice of a Passover in John vi. 4, while he strongly insists upon the feast mentioned in John v. 1, which is nowhere said to have been a Passover, and probably was not. Now this seems as unaccountable, if the word *passover*, existed in the original manuscripts of this Gospel, as that a writer, at the present day, in contending against the opinion of the shorter ministry, should omit all notice of this Passover, which, if the reading be genuine, and the feast be distinct from the last, is decisive upon the question.

It may be replied, that the above conjecture is opposed by all the critical authorities for settling the text, and cannot be allowed for the sake of supporting a previously assumed hypothesis. To the argument that is drawn from Herod's not having heard of our Saviour till after the death of John, it may be replied, that he was probably occupied with affairs of state; perhaps engaged in a distant military expedition. To the argument drawn from the fact, that there are no more notices of public festivals, which Jesus celebrated at Jerusalem, it may he replied, that he, who was 'greater than the temple,' and 'Lord of the Sabbath,' could dispense with the obligation of attendance, and with the greater reason, since the Jews, at the second festival, had sought his life.

In reviewing the arguments that were brought forward in the controversy between Priestley and Newcome, it appears to us, that the common opinion, of the three years' duration of our Saviour's ministry, has not been sustained. Nor do we think that Priestley has succeeded in sustaining his opinion, that Christ was crucified upon the second Passover after his baptism. The conjecture of an interpolation in John vi. 4, and also, what Priestley has connected with it, of a transposition of the fifth and sixth chapters of John, we feel unwilling to admit; requiring, as it does, an unauthorized alteration of the text.

The objections, moreover, appear to us conclusive against

Priestley's arrangement of events, which crowds so large a proportion of the recorded transactions of our Saviour's life within the insufficient period of fifty days succeeding the first Passover. This is a striking peculiarity in Priestley's calendar. According to his arrangement, almost every thing recorded by the Evangelists is placed within the first four months of Christ's ministry, while *no account* is given of several of the following months, and but very few transactions are assigned to the whole remaining period of *eight months*, till his arrival at Bethany, a week before his crucifixion. That this is a proper distribution of the events in our Saviour's ministry seems to us, in the highest degree, improbable.

From the ground we have now passed over, we may be better able to appreciate the merits of Dr. Carpenter's plan, upon which the Harmony, named at the head of this article, has been constructed. Dr. Carpenter's views upon this subject were first published, we believe, in his 'Introduction to the Geography of the New Testament,' in 1806. The essential principles of his arrangement are these,—'(1) The ministry of Christ included two Passovers only; (2) The Passover referred to in John vi. 4 (in connexion with the miracle of the five thousand), was that, at which our Lord was crucified; and (3) St. Matthew's order claims a general preference.' 'If any of the three be true,' says the author, 'Archbishop Newcome's arrangement cannot be correct. If the second be true, Dr. Priestley's arrangement cannot be correct. The general features of the arrangement here given depend upon the two former; many of the details upon the last. The second only is peculiar to it.'* It will be perceived, then, that the main peculiarity of Carpenter's plan consists in the supposition, that the Passover mentioned in John vi. 4, near the time of the feeding of the five thousand, was the Passover at which our Saviour was crucified.

This opinion seems first to have been advanced by G. J. Vossius, about two hundred years ago; but no arrangement of the Gospels, we believe, has ever before been formed upon it. By this supposition, we are relieved from the necessity of making an alteration in the text, and avoid many other considerable difficulties. This supposition the author believes

* Introduction to the Geography of the New Testament. Sixth edition, page 70.

to be required, by the order of arrangement in the first three Gospels. That feast is mentioned by John as introductory to the feeding of the five thousand; but this miracle could have been performed, according to the other Evangelists, but a short time previous to the crucifixion Passover. For, says the author, 'The portion of Matthew's Gospel, which begins at chapter xiv. 13, and ends with chapter xx. 34, contains a regular, uninterrupted narrative of what Jesus did, apparently a short time before his sufferings at Jerusalem. This portion begins with the feeding of the multitudes near Bethsaida beyond the Jordan; and therefore from Matthew's narrative we should suppose, that this miracle was performed a short time before the Passover, at which our Lord suffered. A little more than a month will be sufficient for all the events recorded by Matthew, from the feeding of the five thousand to the crucifixion of our Lord.'* It is in this portion of Matthew's Gospel, it may be added, that a representation is commenced, which is continued for several chapters together, that the time was near at hand, when Jesus should be separated from his disciples. Many of the discourses of our Saviour to his Apostles, here recorded, seem to have been intended to prepare them for their approaching separation. Other considerations tend to confirm the position. Supposing a year to have intervened between the feeding of the five thousand and the last Passover, four national festivals must have occurred; and Jesus must have delivered discourses and wrought some striking miracles, at the feasts of Tabernacles and Dedication; of all which not the least vestige is to be found in either of the first three Gospels. It is no reply to this to say, that no festivals are mentioned by the first three Evangelists, between the baptism of Christ and the crucifixion Passover; for according to Dr. Carpenter's arrangement, no notice of such festivals was to have been expected; because the Apostles were not called to their attendance upon Jesus till after the commencement of his ministry in Galilee, which was subsequent to the Feast of Tabernacles; and, of course, no festival occurred before the last Passover, except that of Dedication, and this is supposed to have been celebrated during the mission of the Twelve.

* Introduction to the Geography of the New Testament. First American edition, pp. 74, 75.

According to Dr. Carpenter's plan, then, it will be perceived, that the sixth chapter of John's Gospel is to be transposed, if we would arrange its several sections according to the order of time. He therefore recommends, that this chapter, which is a complete section of itself, be placed between the 54th and 55th verses of chapter xi, at which place is a division of sections. By this transposition, the Passover, which is said, in John vi. 4, to be nigh, when the five thousand were miraculously fed, is the same which is again mentioned in John xi. 55, and the same at which our Saviour was crucified.

Dr. Carpenter's arrangement, we conceive, has a decided advantage over Priestley's in supposing the incidents of our Saviour's ministry to thicken as it advanced, and the close of it particularly to be crowded with memorable events. We should be happy, however, to feel better satisfied, that its peculiar and fundamental position is tenable. It seems to us not easy to comprise every thing recorded by Matthew, between the feeding of the five thousand and the crucifixion Passover, within the short period of a month. It may be difficult, indeed, to insert, in this portion of Matthew, the four festivals of a year, when no notice is taken of any one of them; but we would suggest, whether as great a difficulty may not attend the supposition, that our Saviour travelled from Capernaum into the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon, and back to the eastern shore of the Lake, *through Decapolis*, a journey, at the lowest computation, of seventy-five or eighty miles, in the space of six or seven days? This is the time assigned for the journey by Dr. Carpenter. But we do not discover that he has made any allowance for the *three days' continuance* of the four thousand with Jesus, previous to the second miracle of the loaves. On the 6th or 7th of March, Christ set out on this journey, as is supposed; and on the 14th, he is said to have fed the four thousand, who according to Matthew came to him *after his arrival* at the Lake, and *continued with him three days*. Matthew xv. 29, 30, and 32. Deducting these three days from the period assigned, and but four or five at most can remain for this journey, part of it through a mountainous country, and Jesus attended by his disciples. Matthew xv. 23. We would not intimate that such a journey, and on foot too, was impossible; but the inquiry at once suggests itself, what could have been its ob-

ject? Priestley allows a fortnight or three weeks for this journey of our Saviour, and a week or two more for his coming through Decapolis. Immediately after the feeding of the four thousand, on the 14th of March, Dr. Carpenter supposes Jesus to pass along by the eastern shore of the lake, to the neighbourhood of Magdala and Dalmanutha, and to cross the lake early on the 15th to Bethsaida; thence, without any stay, to set out for Cæsarea Philippi, at which place he is supposed to arrive on the 18th of March. Here then is another distance of about fifty or sixty miles, travelled by Jesus, in company with his disciples, in four days; making, with the previous journey, not less than one hundred and thirty miles, between March 6th, and 18th, and including a stay of three days in one place. On his return from Cæsarea Philippi, he is supposed to spend but a single day at Capernaum, and then to take his final departure from Galilee. In making such a circuit, and travelling fourteen or fifteen miles a day, what time could have been found for the performance of the miracles recorded, or for the delivery of his discourses? Does the portion of Matthew's Gospel, from chap. xiv. 13, to xx. 34, contain so closely connected a narrative as to oblige us to suppose such rapidity in our Saviour's progress? To the inhabitants of the cities and villages, through which he passed, he must, indeed, as Newcome has remarked, in reference to another supposition, 'have appeared and vanished like a meteor.'

But though the arrangement of the facts in the Gospel history upon Dr. Carpenter's plan is encumbered, as it seems to us, with some considerable difficulties, we readily acknowledge they are neither so many nor so great, as those which press upon all other Harmonies, with which we are acquainted. We feel desirous of knowing if these difficulties may not be avoided, by an arrangement on the hypothesis, that Christ was crucified on the third passover after his baptism. Some names of eminence might be mentioned in support of the opinion, that such was the duration of our Saviour's ministry; but no Harmony that has come to our knowledge has been properly constructed upon it.

It remains to speak of the execution of the work before us. 'It was undertaken,' we are told in the Preface, 'with no other view than to favor the usefulness of a course of expository lectures, which the editor was intending to deliver.'

'The text is that of the Common Version, conformed to Griesbach's edition of the Greek.' A Calendar of our Lord's ministry is affixed to it, taken from the last edition of Carpenter's Geography. Whatever may be thought of some of the principles of Carpenter's plan, the editor of this work has rendered a valuable service to the public, by carrying out these principles in the arrangement of the Gospel narratives, and furnishing us with a Harmony, decidedly preferable we think to any other, in a much more convenient form, and combining all the advantages which arise from an orderly distribution of events, and a juxta position of parallel passages. The several narratives, when read in this close connexion, throw light upon each other; and, though we may doubt respecting the actual position of some of the events, or the length of the period that elapsed, a more distinct impression of reality is produced, than possibly can be when the accounts are separately read. Without some orderly arrangement, and the necessary associations of time and place, the ideas we have of the events in our Saviour's life will be vague and floating in the mind.

Most other Harmonies are in an unwieldy form, and many are encumbered with paraphrase, commentary, and notes. It is no inconsiderable recommendation of the publication before us, that it is strictly what it purports to be 'a Harmony of the Gospels.' It appears to be executed with all the accuracy and fidelity to the principles of arrangement which Dr. Carpenter proposed, that we should expect from the gentleman who prepared it. 'Having undertaken to exhibit the plan of Dr. Carpenter,' the editor did not think himself 'at liberty to make any change'; though in a few instances, in which Dr. Carpenter deviates in the arrangement from the order of Matthew, the editor seems to think the deviation not to have been required. We cannot but think there is considerable force in the remarks of the editor, and that in these cases, not less than elsewhere, the order of Matthew deserves the preference. We would take the liberty, however, to suggest, in reference to Matthew xii. 1, that February 18th, the time assigned by Carpenter for the death of the Baptist, would seem to be early for barley to be in ear, and that the expression of Luke, vi. 1, '*rubbing them in their hands*,' would seem to imply that the kernels were *full-formed*; and not merely *in the milk*, but sufficiently firm

and dry to be separated by this operation from the husks. Dr. Shaw says, that 'barley, all over the Holy Land, was in full ear in the beginning of April; and about the middle of that month it began to turn yellow.'* If there be ground then for these remarks, the plucking of the ears of corn must imply a later season than February 18th, and, without deviation from the order of Matthew in this instance, will prove, perhaps, a Passover to have occurred, distinct both from the first and the last.

We have noticed that a few inconsiderable alterations in the arrangement have been made by Dr. Carpenter, in the last edition of his Geography. Christ's visit to Nazareth, and the miraculous draught of fishes, he would now place soon after the Pentecost, about the 28th of May, instead of the position they occupy in the Harmony, after the imprisonment of John. Four parables also, viz. of the Unjust Steward, the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Unjust Judge, and the Pharisee and Publican, placed at the end of the Harmony, 'among facts and discourses of uncertain date,' Carpenter in his last edition refers to the period of Christ's stay at Bethany in Peræa. We think it desirable to assign a date, if it have any probability in its favor, to as many of these 'facts and discourses' as possible. They make, at best, but an unseemly appendage to a *Harmony*.

Receiving every thing, as we do, with respect, which comes from the author of this arrangement, we are much gratified to learn, from the preface to his Geography, that he intends yet 'to state the grounds of it more fully and critically.' We shall be happy to be convinced that the *peculiar* principle of his arrangement is free from some difficulties, which seem to us to press upon it. If we are not mistaken in our conjecture respecting the writer of some late articles, 'On the Chronology and Arrangement of the Gospel Narratives,' in the Monthly Repository, a Harmony, constructed upon these very principles by the author himself, has been long prepared, and will shortly be committed to the press.

---

* Shaw's Travels, 3d edit. Vol. ii. p. 137.

ART. VII. — 1. *Review of Mr. Whitman's Letters to Professor Stuart, on Religious Liberty.* [From 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims.'] *With an Appendix not before published.* Boston. Peirce & Parker. 1831. 8vo. pp. 84.

2. *A Reply to the Review of Whitman's Letters to Professor Stuart in 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims' for March,* 1831. By BERNARD WHITMAN. Boston. Gray & Bowen. 1831. 8vo. pp. 84.

THERE is something unspeakably ludicrous in the idea of receiving from 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims' a moral lecture on the decencies of controversy. Knowing the extreme aversion, which Unitarians have always felt and expressed for discussions necessarily involving direct and offensive personalities, the conductors of that work probably hoped and expected, that Professor Stuart's demand for the facts, with the names and dates, on which the charges against Exclusionists were founded, would be passed over without notice. In that case they would have been among the first to interpret the silence into a confession, that those charges could not be sustained; and not a few of their well-meaning readers might have thought the inference a fair one, and been misled. If Professor Stuart and his friends were sincere in demanding a specification of the crimes and misdemeanors imputed to the Exclusive party, they can hardly be so now in the pain and disgust, which they affect at the turn the controversy has taken. As for others, it will serve to correct an excessive sensitiveness to discussions of this nature, if they reflect that nothing, perhaps, is so likely to inculcate moderation, both of language and measures, on the leaders of the dominant sect, as a thorough and fearless exposition, like that which Mr. Whitman has given, of their intrigues and usurpations.

Of the general merits of the Review considered as an answer to Mr. Whitman's Letters we have heard but one opinion expressed from any quarter.* The childish array

* We stand corrected. Since writing the above, we have looked into 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims' for June, and find that the Reviewers themselves think very highly of their former effort. The general character of their review of Mr. Whitman's Reply is the same with that of their review of his Letters.

which it makes of pretended corrections, those being rejected that originate in mere quibble or evasion, or relate to trifling verbal inaccuracies not affecting in any way the argument, dwindles to some ten or twenty. These have called out Mr. Whitman again, who in the Reply not only establishes incontestably the substantial truth and accuracy of his previous statements, but brings forward several additional facts, and a mass of entirely new evidence in support of the same general positions. It is but justice to the sagacity of his Reviewers to say, that, so far at least as respects the proof of the material facts, they appear to have foreseen, that this would be the result of the investigation. Accordingly, we find them asserting or intimating, in repeated instances, that, even if most of Mr. Whitman's statements and charges could be shown to be well founded, it would not convict them of any thing, which they are not prepared to defend and justify. This, as it seems to us, is beyond question the most serious and alarming aspect, under which the present controversy can be viewed; not that the conduct of Exclusionists has been as Mr. Whitman represents it, but that they now think to justify such conduct, and intimate a determination to persist in it. At the risk, therefore, of repeating ourselves, and of being accounted needlessly minute, we shall proceed to analyze, and thoroughly disentangle and expose the commonplace sophistry on this subject.

'It will be insisted, doubtless,' say the Reviewers,' that in the "use we make of creeds," in our "Ministerial intercourse," our "Ecclesiastical tribunals," &c. &c., we have shown ourselves the determined enemies of religious freedom, and have manifested even a persecuting spirit. It will appear, however, on examination, that were we to admit the correctness of no small part of Mr. Whitman's statements (which we do not admit) we have done no more than is perfectly consistent with our religious *principles*, our *liberty*, and *rights*.

'We certainly have the right to study the Scriptures for ourselves, to form our opinions in view of them, and to speak and act agreeably to these opinions, so long as we do not interfere with the rights and liberties of others. Mr. Whitman has no more right to think for us, than we for him — to prescribe and dictate our opinions, than we his. Suppose, then, that after long and careful attention to the Scriptures, we satisfy ourselves of the correctness of the Orthodox faith. We *believe*, that the Scriptures contain and teach the doctrines of

the Trinity, of Divine sovereignty, of human depravity, of the atonement, of regeneration by the special influences of the holy Spirit, of justification by faith, of the perseverance of saints, of a general judgment, and of eternal retribution. Have we not a right so to believe? Have we not a right to retain and cherish our honest convictions in regard to these most important subjects? And if we have a right so to believe, have we not a right to sum up our belief on paper, and form a written confession of our faith? And if we find two, three, or half a dozen, who have come to the same conclusions with ourselves, have we not a right to *associate*, on the basis of a common faith, and constitute a society, a church? If we are pleased thus to associate, and do it in a peaceable manner, who shall hinder us? Have we not as much right to associate with a creed, as others have to do the same without one? May not we as properly dictate to them on the subject as they to us? And when we have associated, on the express understanding of a common faith, suppose one of our number widely departs from this faith; have we not a right to call him to an account? And if he chooses to exercise his freedom in wandering from us, and violating the express principles of the association, have we not a right to exercise our freedom, in excluding him, or withdrawing from him? Do not all voluntary associations for *civil* purposes consider themselves entitled to treat delinquent members after this manner? And why should religious associations be an exception? We have, indeed, no right to injure our erring brother, in his person, property, or good name, any further than to call things by their right names, and tell the truth about him when occasion requires it; and who shall deny us the liberty to do this?' *Review*, pp. 10, 11.

The Reviewers know, that their right to study the Scriptures for themselves, to form their own opinions on religious subjects, and to speak and act agreeably to these opinions, so long as they do not interfere with the rights and liberties of others, has never been disputed by Unitarians. The truisms and solemn interrogatories with which the discussion is introduced, are adapted, and perhaps were intended, to blind or mislead the reader as to the real question at issue. The question is not, whether Exclusionists have a right to speak and act agreeably to their opinions, so long as they do *not* interfere with the rights and liberties of others; but whether they have a right to speak and act agreeably to their opinions, when, as it is believed, they *do* interfere with the rights and liberties of others.

Considerable adroitness is also shown by the Reviewers in managing the transition, when, from insisting on universally acknowledged principles, they begin to touch on debatable ground. 'Have we not a right,' they ask, 'to sum up our belief on paper, and form a written confession of our faith?' Certainly they have, if by a confession of faith, or creed, is meant a record of their convictions for the time being, and nothing more. But if this confession of faith, or creed, is regarded, not only as a simple record of the convictions of the individual at the time of drawing it up, but as a rule of his own faith afterwards, or as a rule of faith to others, then does it become a fetter, an imposition. 'And if we find two, three, or half a dozen, who have come to the same conclusions with ourselves, have we not a right to *associate*, on the basis of a common faith, and constitute a society, a church?' Here the fallacy originates in confounding the church with a mere voluntary association, like a debating club, a masonic lodge, or a manufacturing company. Even if we were to admit, that Exclusionists have a right to form themselves into as many voluntary associations as they please, on the basis of a common faith, it would not follow that these associations, thus constituted, would have a right, jointly or severally, to call themselves *the church*, or assume the prerogatives of a church, or any one of these prerogatives. But, say the Reviewers, 'May not we as properly dictate to Unitarians on the subject, as they to us?' Just as properly. The truth is, that in a particular congregation neither party has a right to dictate to the other; and therefore neither party is at liberty to act on the assumption of such a right, and exclude the other. But they ask again, 'Do not all voluntary associations for *civil* purposes consider themselves entitled to treat delinquent members after this manner? And why should religious associations be an exception?' Because in civil matters some umpire is always acknowledged or recognised by both parties, by which, in cases of difference, the question is authoritatively determined; but in religion, so far as mere opinion is concerned, Protestants deny the existence of such an umpire. 'We have, indeed, no right,' the Reviewers allow, 'to injure our erring brother, in his person, property, or good name, any further than to call things by their right names, and tell the truth about him when occasion requires it; and who shall deny us the liberty to do this?'

Unitarians will not, most assuredly. What we complain of, is, that Exclusionists, while the questions, who is the erring brother, and what is the truth about him, are still pending, proceed to speak and act as if they had been definitively settled.

The Reviewers go on;

'But it will be said, "If you form your church with a creed, then all who cannot adopt the creed will be kept out of it." And what if they are? Is there no church in the world, except ours? If persons cannot agree to walk with us, then let them seek those with whom they can walk. Or if they cannot find any with whom they are agreed, then let them be content to walk alone.

'It will also be objected, that by excluding the member who wanders from us, we render him unpopular, excite suspicion, and inflict an injury. This may be so, or it may not be, according to the character of our association, and the circumstances under which he is excluded. But if he does receive injury, whose fault is it? The society, surely, are not to blame; and if he is a reasonable man, he will never blame them.' — *Review*, p. 11.

The answer to the question, 'Is there no church in the world, except ours?' must depend on what is understood by 'church.' If the term is used to signify the 'household of faith,' then there is, strictly speaking, but one church, and he who does not belong to that, belongs to none. If, on the other hand, by a church is intended the communicants belonging to a particular congregation, it is true there are many churches; but if an individual has a right to belong to any one of them, it would seem that he has a right to belong to that where he lives and worships. To drive a sincere believer from the Lord's table in Berkshire County, for example, and then to think to reconcile him to the privation by telling him that probably there are churches in Boston, or London, or Pekin, which would admit him to communion, seems to us, we must confess, very much like adding insult to injury. Of course we would not compel a person to communicate with his fellow-worshippers, if he can find more comfort or edification in communicating with others. 'If persons,' to borrow the language of the Reviewers, 'cannot agree to walk with us, then let them seek those with whom they can walk.' What we complain

of, is, that 'two, three, or half a dozen' ordinary men in a Christian congregation should take possession of the Lord's table, and not only presume to dictate the terms on which it shall be approached, but make these terms such as must necessarily exclude perhaps ten times their own number of men and women as good and pious as themselves. The Reviewers are aware, that their system must inflict injury on the excluded member; 'but,' they ask, 'if he does receive injury, whose fault is it?' We answer, that it is the fault of the 'society,' if they choose to call it so, which, in inflicting the injury, usurps a prerogative which neither God, nor Christ, nor the Bible, nor the state has ever granted or recognised.

We shall give one more specimen of the reasoning of the Reviewers.

'Again; in the exercise of our freedom, we not only adopt the Orthodox faith, but come to regard it as the *only true faith;* so that those who essentially depart from it we cannot think are, in the strictest and best sense of the term, *Christians.* Still they call themselves Christians, and claim our fellowship. But, in consistency with our principles and rights, can we grant it? They have as good a right to their honest opinions, as we have to ours. They may think of themselves as they please, and call themselves by what name they please. But they have no right to dictate to us what we shall think of them, or what we shall call them. They have no right to insist upon enjoying our fellowship, when, in consistency with our principles, we cannot grant it.

'The attentive reader will perceive, in view of the foregoing remarks, that no small part of what Mr. Whitman charges upon the Orthodox as persecution and oppression, and altogether inconsistent with "free inquiry and religious liberty," is but the *necessary result* of their religious liberty. They could not have their liberty, and do otherwise. They certainly have the right, as much so as Mr. Whitman, or any other man, to adopt their own religious principles, and to act according to them; and it will be found, on examination, that most of the charges urged against them in his First Letter (bating the false coloring and inaccuracies of statement) are the natural and inevitable result of their honest principles.' — *Review,* p. 12.

Do the Reviewers suppose that any body thinks, that, strictly speaking, there is, or can be, more than *one* 'true

faith'? Who, however, among the various denominations of professed Christians have hit exactly upon this true faith, or hold every thing essential to it, are questions which it is not for any individual, or for any 'society' to decide. They are questions, which, on account of our fallibility, are not to be decided irreversibly, even by ourselves for ourselves. No one, therefore, has a right to assume the Christian name, or to claim or expect that it should be awarded him by others, on the ground that he really holds the 'only true faith,' or every thing essential to it; but only on the ground, that he honestly thinks that he does so. It is on this ground, and this ground alone, that we yield the name to Exclusionists, or claim it for Unitarians. 'They' [Unitarians, we suppose] 'may think of themselves as they please,' say the Reviewers, 'and call themselves by what name they please. But they have no right to dictate to us what we shall think of them, or what we shall call them.' What then? The controversy does not turn on what Unitarians have a right to 'dictate' to the Exclusionist, but on what the Exclusionist ought to do without such dictation. But, continue the Reviewers, in the same gracious humor, 'They have no right to insist upon enjoying OUR fellowship.' We are sorry to disturb for a moment the complacency, with which these gentlemen contemplate the amount of enjoyment to be derived from their personal 'society' and 'fellowship.' Nevertheless we are constrained to say, that if this enjoyment were all that is at stake, we think we should be able to bear up under the privation with a tolerable degree of equanimity. Wherever we are called to be in the providence of God, let them but leave us in the possession of every right, and every privilege, which a Christian, as such, may claim, and we shall be content.

It would be interesting and useful to trace the practical errors of Exclusionists to their origin, that we might expose and refute the principle itself. Our limits now will permit us to notice but two or three mistakes, which run through and vitiate most of the reasonings on this subject. One of these mistakes originates in an equivocal use of the term *right*. It may be right, so far as government and law are concerned, that is to say, it may be civilly right, that a man should be at liberty to frame a creed, and bind himself, in common with others, to adhere to it by the most solemn pledges.

But it is clear, that such a step cannot be morally right, if, as we presume all will admit, every one is under a prior and paramount obligation, especially on a subject so important as religion, to keep his mind open to conviction, and in all respects unshackled. Take the case of a man who is convinced, not only that his present opinions are correct, but that it would be a sin for him to alter them. Now we say even of such a person, that he has no moral right to impose restrictions or impediments on his own freedom of thought. It would be to begin by assuming as true, what, as a fallible being, he ought to know, and must know, is false; namely, that by continuing his inquiries, with a perfectly free and unprejudiced mind, he is incapable of receiving more light. Our obligation to obey the truth is not clearer, or stronger, than our obligation to weigh its evidences; and our obligation to weigh its evidences is not clearer, or stronger, than our obligation to keep our minds in such a state as will enable us to weigh them impartially.

Mistaken notions are also entertained by Exclusionists respecting the *rights of a majority* in religion. Protestantism did not take from the Pope the prerogative to decide what a man must believe in order to be a Christian, that it might confer it on a bench of bishops, or a synod of presbyters, or the whole body of believers acting in their collective capacity. The last would be just as incompatible as either of the former with a consistent Protestantism, which lays it down as a first principle, that in determining what are the essentials of the Christian faith there is no other rule but the Scriptures, and no other interpreter of the Scriptures but the understanding and conscience of the individual. We have heard a great deal, of late, about the Republican genius of Christianity and Congregationalism; and if by this it is only meant, that both are opposed to every form of despotism or aristocracy, it is well. But if, as we suspect, it is intended to insinuate, that in the church as in the state, in matters of religious belief as well as of civil policy, the will of the majority is to be the law, the analogy fails altogether. Any man is a Christian, who holds what he honestly believes to be the Christian doctrine; and any man who gives satisfactory evidence of doing this, has a right to the name and privileges of a Christian, and no party or community has a right to withhold them. To appeal, in this case, from the rights of the individual to what

are called the rights of the majority, is neither more nor less than appealing from right to force. This would be true if, in voting a man out of the church, as not being a Christian, the appeal were made to the majority of the whole body of believers, and not to that of the 'two, three, or half a dozen' communicants with whom he happens to be associated.

But say the Reviewers, referring to the Unitarians,

'They complain of the Orthodox, because they will not exchange pulpits with them. Why will not they exchange with the professed Universalist? They complain of us for encroaching on their liberty and rights, because we represent their views of doctrine as erroneous and unsafe. And why do they encroach, in the same way, on the liberty and rights of the Deist and Atheist, by representing their views of doctrine as erroneous and unsafe?' — *Review*, p. 14.

It is not denied, that the Orthodox have a right to decline ministerial exchanges with Unitarians; but it is denied, that they have a right to do it on the ground that Unitarians are not Christians. When Exclusionists of the Congregational denomination in this State, who from time immemorial had been in the habit of exchanging with their liberal brethren in the vicinity, suddenly, simultaneously, and, as it would seem, by concert, declared their determination to discontinue the practice, the measure led, as was natural, to considerable warmth of expostulation. As a measure of public expediency, ministerial courtesy, or Christian charity, it would not be easy, perhaps, to justify the step; and its consequences, so far as developed, especially in the small country towns, have certainly been ruinous to the harmony and integrity of the Congregational parishes. Still, as a matter of abstract right, it is not denied that Exclusionists are at liberty to decline exchanging with Unitarians, just as Unitarians are at liberty to decline exchanging with them, or with Universalists, or with one another. The proper rule, to be observed alike by every minister, seems to be this; to be willing to exchange with those of his brethren, and those only, whether of his own denomination or not, who are likely, all things considered, to be satisfactory and edifying to his people. As for Unitarians and Universalists, they have never been in the habit of exchanging pulpits, and we presume never will

be, until the arrangement is mutually agreeable. Meanwhile, however, and here is the essential distinction, which the Reviewers would fain keep out of sight, as it is fatal to their argument, Unitarians do not decline exchanging with Universalists on the ground that they are not Christians; neither do they debar or expel them, on that or on any other ground, from the Christian ordinances; nor seek to deprive them of any right or privilege which belongs to Christians, as such. With regard to what is thought to be 'erroneous or unsafe' in Calvinism or Universalism, Trinitarianism or Unitarianism, Deism or Atheism, it would be absurd to suppose a man not at liberty to speak, on proper occasions, and in a proper spirit. The charge against Exclusionists is, not that they attempt, by fair reasoning, to show the immoral and dangerous tendency of Unitarianism, but that by bold, fierce, and unsupported denunciations, they seek to create in the minds of the people at large such a horror for the system, as must prevent them from examining its claims.

Still the Reviewers contend, that even if they were 'to admit the correctness of no small part of Mr. Whitman's statements,' they 'have done no more than is perfectly consistent with their religious principles'; that it is but 'the natural and inevitable result of their honest principles,' their 'system of doctrines' 'pushed to its legitimate consequences.' On this point the Reviewers may be right, and probably are so, if they mean, not that their system will justify what has been done, but only that such are its natural and necessary tendencies.

ART. VIII. — *Translations of the Scriptures at Serampore.*

WE have received the following communication from the Professors of the Theological Seminary in Newton, in reply to an article in our last Number, relating to the translations of the Scriptures, which have been undertaken by the Baptist Mission at Serampore. We cheerfully give it

insertion, not only from the respect we entertain for the gentlemen subscribing it, but because the subject is one, in which our common Christianity and common interests are concerned; and we should be truly gratified to know, that the statements which have been made respecting the versions in questions were erroneous. It will not, however, be overlooked, that in our remarks on what we believed to be the errors of their books, we bore our ready testimony to the moral worth and evangelic zeal of the authors; regretting only, that we could not entertain the same confidence in their learning or accuracy as translators.

And this judgment was, we thought, fully sustained by various criticisms of foreign journals. In regard, particularly, to the Marat'ha version, it is true, that 'The Asiatic Journal,' from which we quoted, was the only authority on which we relied. But the Editor of that able Journal, in introducing the article, states, that the author of it is a clergyman of the Church of England, resident in India, and by his well-known learning and integrity, particularly his acquaintance with some of the languages of the country, competent to judge. The writer himself, in the article in question, declares expressly, that he pledges his personal responsibleness for the accuracy of his criticisms; and the numerous examples he adduces, in the very words of the version itself, and the air of candor apparent in his remarks, seemed to authorize the confidence of those, whose own knowledge of the language would not qualify them to make up an opinion on other grounds.

In relation to the other versions, published at Serampore, we shall sincerely welcome whatever may be justly said in their praise or vindication. But our readers are aware, it is not only in the 'Correspondence relative to the Prospects of Christianity in India,' which we largely quoted, but in various English journals, and at different periods, that the same objections have been urged. And, if our recollection serves us, it is in the London Quarterly Review especially, that the 'British and Foreign Bible Society' has been once and again reproached with want of fidelity to its sacred trust, by encouraging and circulating versions from the Baptist press in India, which, as the Reviewers complain, abound in errors.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

Gentlemen,

Our attention has been attracted to an article in the number of your work for May, 1831, entitled 'History of English Baptists,' in which the translations of the Scriptures made at Serampore are mentioned with disapprobation. The statements concerning the translations are sufficiently grave to make every friend of truth and righteousness disquieted; and the inquiry is very natural, whether those statements are warrantable. There has recently come into our hands a pamphlet of seventy-eight pages, octavo, published at London, January, 1830, entitled 'A Defence of the Serampore Marat'ha Version of the New Testament; in reply to the Animadversions of an Anonymous Writer in the Asiatic Journal for September, 1829. By William Greenfield, editor of Bagster's Syriac New Testament, &c.' The number of the Asiatic Journal for September, 1829, is the source whence the Christian Examiner drew its statements respecting the Marat'ha Version of the New Testament. In Mr. Greenfield's pamphlet, the very particulars mentioned in the Christian Examiner as worthy of reprehension, and several other particulars are scrutinized and ably vindicated. Indeed, the statements of the writer in the Asiatic Journal are shown by Mr. Greenfield to evince inaccuracy on the part of the writer, and want of acquaintance with the Marat'ha language. Mr. Greenfield appears from his pamphlet to possess an intimate acquaintance with the leading languages of India, and not to be actuated by feelings of partiality in his examination of the charges preferred by the Asiatic Journal.

Without mentioning at large the statements and reasonings of Mr. Greenfield, permit us to say, that both the instances from the Gospel of John, and that from the Epistle to the Ephesians, (which are all that the Christian Examiner has produced) are set in a very different light by him from that in which they are presented by the writer in the Asiatic Journal. He shows that in the Indian dialects the simple plurals of the pronouns in the second and third persons are honorific; and that when the plural is really intended to be expressed, another plural termination is added. Thus it happens that the pronoun, which an individual not regarding idiom would translate *they*, properly rendered, means *he* or *it*. That is to say, it is used as a plural of excellence, and no more implies real plurality in the Marat'ha language, than the use of אֱלֹהִים (Elohim) implies a plurality of Gods in the Hebrew. Applying this

remark to the second verse of the first chapter of John, rendered in our version, 'The same was in the beginning with God,' and which from the Marat'ha, the Asiatic Journal translates, 'THEY (or these) at first WERE with God,' it appears that though the pronoun and the verb are plural, yet they are plural only out of regard to idiomatical translation; so that when expressed in English, the verse ought to be rendered, 'This (word) was at first with God.'

In remarking upon the next instance which occurs in the Christian Examiner, Mr. Greenfield quotes the words of the Marat'ha version, and accompanies them with an interlinear verbal translation; which translation when arranged according to the English order of the words, is the following; 'Every thing was made by him; and without him was not even one thing made among what was made.'

In the third instance, instead of the rendering contained in the Asiatic Journal and transferred to the Christian Examiner, 'No one *having seen* has ever found God'; a literal version of the Marat'ha placed under the Marat'ha words, is given by Mr. Greenfield, and in English would be thus expressed; 'Not any one hath attained to see God at any time.' Mr. Greenfield shows, that the Marat'ha will not bear the rendering mentioned in the Asiatic Journal, and that the rendering mentioned violates a plain principle of Marat'ha grammar.

The manner in which the word *baptize* is translated is next alluded to in the Christian Examiner; and, as the missionaries at Serampore are Baptists, it is insinuated, that, out of partiality to their own sentiments, they have given an unfaithful translation. Mr. Greenfield, though according to his own statement, 'neither a Baptist nor the son of a Baptist,' vindicates these translators from the charge of sectarianism in their expressing the idea of immersion, by observing, that 'they are found in company with the churches of Syria, Arabia, Ethiopia, Egypt, Germany, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and others, together with the Church of England.' He also examines the declaration, that the phrase '*give a dipping or immersion*,' is 'compounded contrary to the idiom of the language.' On this point he observes, that the phrase is composed of a word signifying *a dipping*, or *immersion*, and a word signifying *to give*; and that this phrase is used instead of the simple verb, which signifies *to dip, immerse*; and the mode of its composition is precisely the same as the Marat'ha form of expressing *to abuse, to answer, to assist*, and many others, which are respectively composed of *abuse, an answer, assistance*, and *to give*. Clearly then the Marat'ha idiom is regarded; and '"*to*

give a dipping or immersion" is a burlesque translation, being contrary to the English idiom, and the word in Marat'ha merely having the sense of the simple verb *to dip, immerse,* as the above compound verbs merely signify *to abuse, to answer, to assist.*'

In respect to the instance in which the word *owl* is said to be used instead of the word *dove,* after stating some very strong improbabilities that Dr. Carey (who, by the way, is a distinguished naturalist, as well as philologist,) could have made and have persisted for years in such a mistake, Mr. Greenfield adverts to the three different styles which are employed in the extensive country where the Marat'ha is spoken, and expresses his opinion, which he sustains with satisfactory reasons, that the word in question may in one of those styles signify *an owl,* and yet in another *a dove.*

Mr. Greenfield shows, that in the instance next alleged, the remarks of the writer in the Asiatic Journal betray a disregard of Marat'ha idiom; and that if fairly translated from the Marat'ha into English, it would be, 'Behold the young sheep of God,' or 'the lamb of God.' He also observes, that 'similar paraphases are not uncommon in the oriental languages, and are frequently and preferably employed even though those languages may possess single words to express the same idea.' And as to the assertion, that one of the words employed is not a Marat'ha word, he remarks, that it is quite as good as a great portion of words in that language; such as the words corresponding to '*anxiety, sense, a sleeve, reputation, peopled, great, noble,* and a thousand others.'

We come now to the 'strange assemblage of words' purporting to be a translation from the Marat'ha version of the 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th verses of the first chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Mr. Greenfield gives the Marat'ha words with a literal interlinear version; and the following, he declares, 'is according to the English idiom and collocation of words'; 'Having made choice of us in him before the laying of the foundation of the world, that we should be pure and blameless before him with love; for that purpose having bestowed all spiritual blessings in heavenly things through Christ, he hath made us possessed of blessings, and by this grace hath made us accepted in the beloved person, for the praise of the glory of that grace of him, who hath before appointed us that we should obtain adoption to himself, according to the pleasure of his own mind through Jesus Christ, — blessed be he the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ! In which beloved we obtain freedom, that is, deliverance from sin, through his blood, by the great riches of his grace.'

He then adds; 'This is a true representation of the Marat'ha text.' In commenting upon the version of this passage presented by the Asiatic Journal, he mentions several words, the meaning of which the writer in the Journal has quite misapprehended.

In other instances, Mr. Greenfield's defence of the Marat'ha version is equally satisfactory; and we cannot resist the impression, that great injustice has been done to Dr. Carey, and that very erroneous representations have been made of the translations on which he has been occupied. And as the statements in the Asiatic Journal respecting the Marat'ha New Testament have so clearly been shown to be groundless, it seems to us the dictate of candor that we at least suspend our judgment on the unfavorable representations concerning the labors of the Serampore missionaries, contained in the 'Correspondence relative to the Prospects of Christianity in India.'

Mr. Greenfield also notices the assertion in the Asiatic Journal, that the Serampore Marat'ha New Testament 'is quite unintelligible to all persons whose native dialect is Marat'ha.' After exhibiting many and powerful considerations against this assertion, he introduces the testimony of Rung-nath, chief Moonshe or Pundit in the Marat'ha language, to the Honorable East India Company. 'I have received,' he says, 'the copy of the Scriptures. The Holy Book, which you have translated into the Marat'ha language is CORRECT. All the MARAT'HAS WILL UNDERSTAND IT; of this there is no doubt.'

Mr. Greenfield concludes his pamphlet with the following paragraph; 'Having thus fairly and fully examined all the charges advanced by the writer of the critique against the Marat'ha Version, the reader will now be convinced, that they have been founded in ignorance and error, if not, in some cases, in wilful and deliberate misrepresentation. It has clearly appeared, that his reasoning is illogical, his statements false, and his retranslations decidedly erroneous; while the whole has been mixed up with the grossest inconsistencies and the most palpable contradictions. Mistaking assumptions for arguments and assertions for proofs, he threw into the scale the weight of his "*name*" and "reputation," and persuaded himself that his readers would concur in his condemnation of the Serampore missionaries. They have, however, proved light as gossamer before the breeze. Truth, like the morning sun, has rolled away the foul mists of error, and discovered to our view the river of the water of life, full, deep, and clear, flowing in the pure channel of the Marat'ha. Human passions and prejudices have not discolored its waters, nor imparted a dele-

terious quality to its fertilizing stream; and we may hence expect that in due season it will cause the wilderness and the solitary place to be glad, and the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose.'

Since many of the readers of the Christian Examiner have probably been led to form an incorrect opinion on this subject, the editors, we are confident, will deem it but an act of justice to insert the present communication.

Yours with Christian love,

IRAH CHASE,
H. J. RIPLEY.

Newton, June 2, 1831.

ART. IX. — *On the Formation of the Christian Character. Addressed to those who are seeking to lead a Religious Life.* By HENRY WARE, Jun., Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care in Harvard University. Boston: Gray & Bowen. Cambridge: Hilliard & Brown. 1831. 18mo. pp. 176.

THE design of this little work may at once be understood from its title, and from the description of readers to whom it is addressed. We hope that this will be found to be a numerous class; and that there are many who will welcome, and, what is more to the author's purpose, will faithfully peruse it. Nor is there any reasonable doubt of this. The eagerness with which good practical works are sought; the demand, which, as they inform us, whose interest or whose professional calling leads them to observe, is continually made for serious devotional books, warrants the belief, that amidst all the worldliness and indifference of heart, with which religion has to contend, as with its deadliest, because least open, enemies, there are yet many who are 'seeking to lead a religious life.' Among them will be found, it is true, very various degrees of earnestness. There may be, and there will be, great want of consistency in the pursuit. They may have reason to reproach themselves with infirmity, and even sin; with

broken purposes, and faltering steps; with hearts yet lingering upon vanities, and prayers returning void. Yet of these there are not a few, who will gladly consider themselves as addressed in this book; and will thank the author for his acceptable — we hope it may prove successful — effort, to guide and encourage them in the Christian life.

We hold the community to be debtors to every writer, who wisely and seriously sets before his fellow-creatures the great objects of religion. And, at first view, considering only the profuse multiplication of books on topics, nearly or remotely connected with religion, we should be ready to suppose, that there could be no deficiency of this sort. To the printing of sermons, of tracts, and theological treatises, there seems indeed to be no end. But, after all, it is surprising how few are exactly adapted to the state of the inquiring Christian; of one who is earnestly desiring to know what he shall do to obtain everlasting life. And hence it comes to pass, that from ministers, in the course of pastoral duty, consulting the various wants of their parishioners, and from private Christians, supplying their own, we hear frequent complaints, that they cannot find what they seek.

Not that books upon most practical subjects are not written; but that they are not written as they should be. They are either too long, or too dry; they want spirit, or they want truth; they are too doctrinal, or they are too cold; they are too fruitful of speculation, or, what to a sincere inquirer is no less an evil, they are chargeable with *overstatement*, with exaggerated, and, therefore, false exhibitions of truth and duty. Of many also, in other respects excellent, it must be said, that while they propose a particular topic, whether doctrine, precept, or ordinance, they fail of presenting it with the clearness, directness, or earnestness essential to their success.

Nor are these objections suggested by an unreasonable or a capricious taste. In looking over some of the best productions of this class, which have obtained a good reputation in the religious world, we see at once how much remains to be desired and to be performed. That celebrated work of Dr. Doddridge, 'The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul,' has unquestionable merits; and we do not wonder at the estimation in which it was held by Dr. Watts, 'to whose request it owed its existence,' or by the Christian

world at large, to whom it has been made known by many translations. But it is impossible to adopt it, on the whole, as a Christian manual. The same must be said of that far-famed and justly famed work, Law's 'Serious Call'; in which, however, so much of certain exterior exercises is required, as, for example, the singing of hymns, the noon-tide and other periodical devotions, that few, but those whose dwelling is with monks, or who have withdrawn from the busy intercourse of the world, would find themselves able to perform it. As to Taylor's 'Holy Living and Dying,' and his 'Life of Christ,' it would be difficult to commend too much the genius or the spirit that pervade them; showing, as is said by one who understood, because he partook of his fine gifts, the 'fancy of a poet, the eloquence of an orator, the wisdom of a philosopher, the sagacity of a prophet, the reason of an angel, and the piety of a saint.' Yet are there passages in Taylor which no one can praise, and some which even modesty might hesitate to repeat.*

Few works of this class have been more generally known, even down to the present day, than the practical writings of Baxter; embracing, as they do, a great variety of useful matter, and supplying a 'Directory' for the whole Christian life. But even with the abridgments they have undergone, to meet the taste and patience of an age, that has long since discarded folios and silenced preachers of a second hour, the diffuseness, repetitions, want of exact method, and vain attempts at embracing in each every essential point, are faults in the best of them; in the 'Saints' Everlasting Rest,' the 'Call to the Unconverted,' and the 'Dying Thoughts,' which all their fine genius, and deep piety, and solemn exhibitions of the 'powers of the world to come,' cannot redeem. The same is true, to a greater or less extent, of most of the celebrated

* We would gladly do something more than barely notice among these old practical works, that celebrated collection, '*The Whole Duty of Man*,' including the 'Gentleman's Calling, Ladies' Calling, Art of Contentment, and Christian's Birth-Right.' The author of this 'incomparable work,' as it has been called, has never been fully ascertained. It has been ascribed, in turn, to Archbishop Sterne, to Dr. Hammond, to Bishop Fell, who edited all the books under this name, and, especially, and with most reason, to *the Lady Dorothy Packington*. The inquiry excited nearly as much interest in the religious world in its day, as did a few years ago the authorship of the novels of the 'Great Unknown.' For an interesting article on the subject, see *The Monthly Anthology*, for April, 1811.

writers of that day, of Flavel and Charnock, of Howe, and even of the accomplished and elegant Bates. We must except, however, from these the spiritual Leighton, whose 'Meditations' and Sermons no one finds wearisome; and Henry Scougal, the youthful author of 'The Life of God in the Soul of Man,' who died too early to have written much, but has left us enough in that beautiful treatise, to make us wish he had lived to write more.

It may be admitted, that the taste of the present day is in the opposite error; that its impatience of length and demand for compression are neither reasonable nor wise; that the best religious books, like the best histories, must go deep into details, which cannot always delight, but are essential to the truth; and that serious readers, who really wish to be instructed or made better, will not refuse to follow their guides through the full length and breadth of their subjects. Be this as it may, the shorter book will, in general, be sure of the preference; and, to come at once to an example altogether to our purpose, the little volume before us, exhibiting plainly and affectionately, with discrimination and feeling, the nature, objects, means, and obligations of religion, will never want a cordial reception. The writer has condensed with great judgment many valuable directions on the most important points, in which the inquiring, particularly the youthful, Christian will find himself interested. As we learn with pleasure, that the work is already in many hands, we the less regret, that our narrow limits scarcely leave us room for extracts. But he that desires to know the nature of true religion, and what is that greatest good, which, as an accountable and immortal being, he is to pursue; he that, doubting, wishes to be assured of his ability to obtain what he would seek, and to know the state of mind he must cherish, and the means he must use, if he would hope for success, will not want instruction, with these pages before him. He may learn how to make his reading of the Scriptures, his private meditation and prayers, his social worship, and his attendance upon the divine word and ordinances, the instruments of his salvation. He will see, moreover, the indispensable importance of the '*Religious Discipline of Life*' to the maintenance of religion in the soul. We particularly recommend this last chapter to the reader's attention. Here are suggestions, which will approve themselves to all who have learned to reflect on their personal duties and dan-

gers; while they apply with great force to some of the prevalent errors and temptations of Christians at the present day. What serious mistakes have been committed by inexperienced Christians, from want of attending to directions like these;

'It is plain that your chief business as well as your great trial, in forming a Christian character, lies in the ordinary tenor of life. The world is the theatre on which you are to prove yourself a Christian. It is in the occurrences of every day, in the relations of every hour, in your affairs, in your family, in your conversation with those around you, in your treatment of them, and your reception of their treatment;—it is in these, that you are to cultivate and perfect the character of a child of God, which you are called to form. It is in these, that your passions are exercised, and your government of them proved; in these, that your command over that unruly member, the tongue, is made known; in these, that temptations to wrong doing and evil speaking beset you, and that you are to apply your religious principle in resisting them. In these it is, consequently, that you discover whether your principle is real and genuine, or whether it lies only in feeling and in words. In the quiet of your chamber, in the devout solitude of your closet, when the world is shut out, and your solemnized spirit feels itself alone with God, you may be so exalted by communion with Heaven, and by meditation on heavenly truth, that all things earthly shall seem worthless and paltry, and every desire be set on things above. * * * But alas, in the closet, and in the third heaven of contemplation, we can live but a small portion of the time. We must come down from the mount. We must enter the crowd and distractions of common life. We must engage in common and secular affairs. And there, * * * in the midst of these things, dangerous, enticing, seductive, you are to live and walk unchanged, unseduced, undefiled; your heart true to its Master, your spirit firm in its allegiance to God, and your soul as truly devout and umble as when worshipping at the altar.'—pp. 15 1, 152.

It is one of the most difficult offices of the teacher of religion to make interesting and forcible its simplest and most frequently repeated instructions; or, as an Apostle expresses it, 'to make manifestation of the truth.' He that does this, is wise to win souls. It is done, we think, with great felicity in this little book; and for the success, with which we hope it may be followed, we heartily commend it to the blessing of God, and to the hearts of all for whom it is designed.

INDEX.

A.

Abbot, Rev. Abiel, 110.

Æschylus, his use of *αἰὼν*, 56.

Αἰών, Letter on the meaning of, 34 *et seq.* — Prof. Stuart's assertion respecting it stated and considered, 35 — its meaning in the LXX to be determined by its use in ancient Greek, 36 — Etymology of the term, 40, *et seq.* 171 — sense given it by lexicographers, 44 — by Hesychius, 46 — by Phavorinus, 47 — actual usage of the word by ancient Greek writers, 50 — by Homer, 53 — by Hesiod, 56 — by Æschylus, 56 — by Pindar, 59 — by Sophocles, 61 — by Aristotle, 166 — by Hippocrates, 177 — by Euripides, 179 — insufficiency of Prof. Stuart's definitions of the term shown, 184 — its true meaning stated, 186 — has very little of the sense of duration in it, 188 — conjecture respecting the use of the term by the Gnostics, 191.

Αἰώνιος, conjecture respecting its introduction, 186.

Aristotle, his use of *αἰὼν*, 166.

Arminianism, M. Vincent's account of, 289.

Asiatic Journal on the Marat'ha Version, 234 — Greenfield's strictures on, 396.

B.

Banking system, evils of, 26.

Baptists, history of, 220, 221 — Baptist Mission in India, 225 — their incompetency to translate the Scriptures illustrated, 226.

Biblical Repository, noticed, 346.

Books, article on uses and abuses of, 240 *et seq.* — advantages of multiplying them, 241 — use in the domestic circle, 245 — their influence on the community, 247 — proper selection of, 251 *et seq.* — means of preventing the publication of injurious books, 254.

Bretschneider's account of German theology, 352 *et seq.*

C.

Calvinism, M. Vincent's account of, 287.

Carpenter, Dr., his plan of a Harmony of the Gospels, examined, 379 *et seq.*

Channing, Dr., Prof. Stuart's Letter to, reviewed, 87 — charged with misrepresenting the Orthodox, 105 — defended against the charge, 109.

Chatham, Lord, 257 — reasons for supposing him to be the author of Junius's Letters, 257 *et seq.*

Children's books, increasing number of, 213 — careful selection of, 213.

Children's Robinson Crusoe, noticed, 218.

Churches, constitution of the primitive, 301.

Codman, Dr., his Speech in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College against the Theological School, 138.

Conscience, plea of, no justification of exclusiveness, 125.

Consociations, an attempt to introduce them into Massachusetts in 1814, 111.

Constant, Benjamin, on religion in France, 273.

Courts of Justice, abuses in, 335 *et seq.*

Cousin Elizabeth, noticed, 216.

D.

Discrepancies in the Gospels, 360.

Duration of Christ's public ministry, 373 — early opinion on this subject, 374 — Mann's and Priestley's opinion, 375 — Newcome's opinion, 377.

E.

Edinburgh Sessional School, account of, 13.
Education, Library of, noticed, 1 — Milton's Treatise on, noticed, 1 — Locke's Thoughts concerning, noticed, 1 — Education, moral, 2 — remarks on, 2 — when complete, 3 — advantages of, 4 — its importance to us as a nation, 4 — evils to be feared from the neglect of, 6 — its influence in checking vice, 7, 8 — means of, 10 — policy of, 10 — influence of lyceums on, 11 — influence of parents on, 11 — its effect on the character of the poor, 12 — objections to, answered in the account of the Edinburgh Sessional School, 13.
Emerson's Appendix to the Political Class Book, 240.
Equality, condition of, enjoyed in this country, 338 — evils attending it, 339 — means of promoting and securing it, 342 — the influence which the example of this country will have on the struggle for equality in Europe, 344.
Errors in religion, truth at the bottom of most, 268.
Euripides, his use of *αἰὼν*, 179.
Evangelists, their character, condition in life, and credibility, 362 — their want of chronological accuracy, 372.
Exclusionists, account of, 107 — article on the rights of, 385–393.
Excommunication, nature and effects of, in Orthodox churches, 94.

F.

Foster, James, a General Baptist, 222.
France, religion in, article on, 273–296 — causes of French infidelity, 276 — character of the religion wanted there, 278 — three classes of French Protestants, 284.
Fuller, Andrew, 225.

G.

German Rationalism, article on, 348–357.
Greek and Roman Classics, reasons for using them as text-books in schools, 210.
Greenfield's answer to the Asiatic Journal on the Marat'ha Version, 394 *te seq.*
Greenwood's Collection of Hymns, noticed, 30 *et seq.*
Grimké's Discourses, reviewed, 193 — objections to his manner of writing 194 *et seq.* — his view of the Bible as a school-book, 20 — objections to his plan, 203 *et seq.*

H.

Hahn, Professor, 348 — strictures on his account of German Rationalism, 349.
Hall, Robert, 64 — works of, noticed, 64 — effect of his controversial works on his literary fame, 64 — his eloquence, 65 — degradation of his powers in controversy, 65 — precocity of, 66 — his opinion of the works of Dr. Edwards, 66 — education of, 66 — friendship with Sir James Mackintosh, 67 — his popularity as a preacher, 67 — insanity of 67, — his ministry at Leicester, 68 — removal to Bristol, 69 — his review of the Memoirs of Lindsey, noticed, 71 — his contempt for Unitarianism, 72 — his feelings as a politician, 74 — his opinion of Mr. Pitt, 75 — inconsistency of his opinions concerning Drs. Price and Priestley, 76 — his character as a christian minister and teacher, 78 — his Sermon on Modern Infidelity, 78 *et seq.* — noticed farther, 224 — account of his death, 272, *note.*
Harmonies of the Gospels, number of, 358 — Richardson's Harmony, 369 — Le Clerc's, 369 — Pilkington's, 370 — Archbishop Newcome's, 370 — Dr. Priestley's, 371
Harmony of the Gospels, article on, 358 *et seq.* — difficulties in making one, 358 — examination of Dr. Carpenter's plan of, 379 — uses of, 382.
Harvard College, theological instruction the original design of, 140 — when and how founded, 148 — authority of the State over it, 149
Hawes, Rev. Joel, D. D., review of May's Letters to, 297 *et seq.*
Hesiod, his use of *αἰὼν*, 56.
Hesychius on the meaning of, *αἰὼν*, 46.
Hexapla, Origen's, account of, 325.
Hollis, Thomas, a General Baptist, 222.
Homer, his use of *αἰὼν*, 53 *et seq.*
Hubbard, Rev. Mr., 119.

I.

Imprisonment for debt, 21 — public abhorrence of, 21 — inadequate to the end proposed, 21 — injurious effects of, 22 — necessity of a change in the system, 22.

Infallibility, confidence in, unjustifiable and injurious, 126, *note*.

Interpretation, Origen's principles of, 322.

J.

Jails, county, noticed, 22 — evils of, 22 — what remedies necessary, 22

Junius, authorship of his Letters, 256 — reasons for supposing Lord Chatham to be the author, 257 — literary merit of, 260 — moral tendency of, 260.

K.

Knight's Analytical Inquiry into the Principles of Taste, extract from, 126.

L.

Lennep on the etymology of *αἰὼν*, 40.

Liberty, religious, Professor Stuart's notions of, canvassed, 89 — when given up voluntarily, 93 — violated in the proceedings of Orthodox churches, 94 — supposes an exemption from religious as well as from civil disabilities and penalties, 98, 118.

Liberty, civil, a sacred trust, 327 — demands, in those who enjoy it, great sobriety and self-restraint, 329 — its dangers, 331.

M.

Macknight's Harmony, 366.

Marat'ha version, strictures on, 236 — reply to them, 394.

May, Samuel J., his Letters to Dr. Hawes, reviewed, 297, 305.

Morality on our political situation, article on the, 327, 346.

N.

Newcome's Harmony, 370.

O.

Origen, article on his life and writings, 306, 327 — his birth and education, 306 — his courage and devotion in youth, 306 — his learning and eloquence, 307 — a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, 309 — visits Rome, 310 — devotes himself with increased ardor to sacred literature, 310 — his fame as a philosopher, 311 — visits an Arabian prince, 312 — removes to Cæsarea, 312 — begins his Commentaries, 313 — persecuted by Demetrius, 314 — had among his scholars Gregory Thaumaturgus, 315 — his extemporaneous homilies reported and published, 317 — imprisoned and tortured, 317 — died at Tyre, 317 — his genius and character, 318 — his writings, 321 — his principles of interpretation, 322 — his book 'Of Principles,' 324 — his Hexapla, 325 — his eight books 'Against Celsus,' 326.

P.

Peter Parley's Tales, noticed, 215.

Phavorinus on the meaning of *αἰὼν*, 47.

Pindar, his use of *αἰὼν*, 59.

Political Class Book, reviewed, 238.

Practical books on religion, value of, 401 — notice of the best, 401.

Priestley's Harmony, 371.

Prison discipline — Reports of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society, reviewed, 15 — importance of the subject, 15 — advantages of, 15 — why the first attempt at reform failed, 15 — necessity of reform, 16 — progress already made in reform, 17 — what objections made to reform, 22 — effects of confining young offenders with the hardened in guilt, 23 — hopes of reclaiming convicts strengthened by experience, 24 — obstacles to reform, 27 — means of preventing the increase of the number of convicts, 28, *note*.

Prison at Charlestown, Mass., account of, 19.

Prison at Auburn, noticed, 26 — increase of convicts at, 28.

Psalms and Hymns, importance of, 31 — Greenwood's Collection, noticed, 32.

Psalms of David, 30 — why unsuited to a modern assembly, 31.